

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01997581 2



E. L. Burkle



The Church of Old England:

A Collection of Papers bearing on the Continuity of the Church in England, and on the attempts to justify the Anglican position.

VOL. III.



LONDON:

OFFICE: 18 WEST SQUARE, SOUTHWARK, S.E.

DEPÔTS: 21 WESTMINSTER BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.; 245 BROMPTON ROAD, S.W.; 22 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1894.

MAY 21 1955

CONTENTS.

The Conversion of England. By H. E. Cardinal Vaughan.

Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders.
By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.

The Revival of the Catholic Faith in England. By C. T. Gatty, F.S.A.

Why I left the Church of England. By James Britten, Hon. Sec. C.T.S.

Before and After the Reformation.

The Foreign and English "Reformation."

Why should we remember the Fifth of November?

The Truth about the Reformation.

England's Title: Our Lady's Dowry. By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.SS.R.

THE CHURCH OF OLD ENGLAND :

VOL. I. *Containing :—*

The Church of Old England. By the Rev. J. D. Breen, O.S.B.
The Continuity of the English Church. By the Very Rev. Canon Croft. [worth

The Popes and the English Church. By the Rev. W. Water-A Voice from the Dead ; being a letter to an Anglican Friend, by the Count de Montalembert.

“Church Defence,” or Notes on the History of the Catholic Church in England.

Plain Truths in answer to Transparent Falsehoods. •

Was the British Church Roman Catholic ?

The English Church always Roman Catholic.

How Henry VIII. robbed England of the Faith.

Papery in the First Century.

The Four Doctors.

The Reformation under Queen Elizabeth.

Church Endowments—Whose are they ?

Was St. Peter Bishop of Rome ? By C. F. B. Allnatt.

VOL. II. *Containing :—*

Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries. By Cardinal Manning. Smith, S.J.

Papal Supremacy and Infallibility. By the Rev. Sydney F.

The Bible and the Reformation. By C. F. B. Allnatt.

Was Barlow a Bishop ? By the late Serjeant Bellasis.

Before and after Gunpowder Plot. By E. Healy Thompson.

189 : or, the Church of Old England protests. By the Rev. J. D. Breen, O.S.B.

The Faith of the Ancient English Church concerning the Holy Eucharist. By the Very Rev. Provost Northcote.

VOL. IV. *Containing :—*

Blessed Peter and the English People. By Cardinal Vaughan.

How “the Church of England washed her Face.” By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.

The Faith of the Ancient English Church concerning the Blessed Virgin. By the Very Rev. Provost Northcote.

Points of Anglican Controversy :—

1. “Securus Judicat Orbis Terrarum.”

2. The Reunion of Christendom.

3. “The Bishop in the Church and the Church in the Bishop.”

4. The Unity of the Church.

The Church of God vindicated by Non-Catholics. 1. Marks of the Church. By H. Morden Bennett, M.A.

How I came Home. By Lady Herbert.

Steps to the Church.

An Appeal to Anglicans.

[Church.

“The Church Defence Institution” and the Early English Archbishop Benson and “The New Italian Mission.”

Does an Anglican “forsake the Church of his Baptism” by becoming a Roman Catholic ?

Are they Priests ?

The Branch Theory.

Continuity Reconsidered. By J. Hobson Matthews.

And other papers.



England's Conversion

by

the Power of Prayer.*

BY THE

BISHOP OF SALFORD.

The Obligations of Catholics.

CATHOLICS of this country have two obligations, two kinds of duty, towards England—the one of the natural, the other of the supernatural, order. By the first, we are bound to be good subjects, loyal to the Constitution, zealous for its improvement, ready to serve the common weal, and to give our time, our care, our substance, and ourselves in its defence. Thus all good national movements—for instance, for the promotion of temperance, thrift, education, the defence of the country, the better housing of the poor, the adjustment of differences between labour and capital, claim our hearty co-operation. The Catholics of England have never been wanting in true patriotism. Time was when, on account of their fidelity to God, they were under suspicion, and were treated as aliens, criminals and traitors. But persecution

* A Paper read before the Catholic Truth Society's Conference at Birmingham, July 2nd, 1890

was never able, during its long course, to eradicate from their hearts their love of England and their desire to benefit their fellow countrymen. At the present moment, whatever our shortcomings, lack of opportunity, failure or success in public life, the Catholics of England are not only proud of their country, but they account it a privilege and a high honour to promote its welfare and prosperity.

The other obligation which presses upon them is of the supernatural order; and, although it may not be felt as sensibly as the first, because it does not appeal to the natural man, it is a far higher and nobler obligation, for it directly tends to create a happiness which is not transient and temporal, but lasting and eternal. It is none other than to bring our fellow countrymen to the true knowledge, love, and service of God in this world, so that, glorifying Him properly here, they may be happy with Him for ever hereafter.

It would be strange indeed were we willing to promote the happiness of our fellowmen during the brief span of this earthly life, and yet utterly heedless of what became of them beyond the grave. It would be impossible to believe in the sincerity of that love which professed concern for the passing present, but complete indifference to the eternal future.

One Way to Heaven.

Now the Catholic doctrine as to salvation is very different from the opinions on this subject held by non-Catholics. These may hold that all religions, however contradictory, are pleasing to God; that all roads lead to heaven, provided the travellers agree among themselves to say that they do so.

Catholic truth and revelation forbid us to hold any such convenient theory. We hold that there is but *one* way, and that a *narrow* way; that there is but *one* Faith, as there is but one God and one Baptism; that without this one Faith it is impossible to please God; and that no man, unless he be born again of water and

of the Holy Ghost, can ever enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

I am well aware how repugnant this doctrine is to the lax, illogical, and self-righteous public opinion of the present day. But the question is not—What does public opinion say? but, What is the teaching of the Word of God?

On this matter listen to the official teaching of the Church, taken from the Papal Allocution *Singulari quadam*.

“We have heard with grief [such are the words of the Vicar of Christ] that a dangerous error has been spread in certain parts of Christendom—that even many Catholics think that they may hope for the eternal salvation of all who are outside the pale of the true Church of Christ. Wherefore they ask, what will be the condition after death of those who have not submitted to the Catholic Faith; and their conclusions are in conformity with their unsound reasonings.

“Far be it from us, Venerable Brethren, to pretend to place a limit to the Divine Mercy, which is infinite. Far be it from us to wish to penetrate the inscrutable counsels or the mysterious judgments of God, which are an abyss into which the human mind cannot penetrate. But it is the duty of Our apostolic office to stir up your episcopal solicitude and vigilance, so that you make every effort to remove from the minds of men the opinion, as impious as it is fatal, which declares that the way of salvation is to be found in every religion. Teach men with the greatest care and learning that the doctrines of the Catholic faith are in no way opposed to Divine mercy and justice. It must be held as of faith that outside the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved; that she is the only ark of salvation; and that whoever shall not have entered within her pale will perish in the flood.

“On the other hand, it must be held with certainty that ignorance of the true religion, if this ignorance be invincible, is not a sin in the eyes of God. But who will assume to himself the right to define the limits of

such ignorance, considering the extraordinary diversities of condition and circumstance to be found in peoples, countries, and human affairs? When we shall have put off the trammels of the body, we shall then see God as He is, and shall understand perfectly the admirable and indissoluble bonds which unite Divine mercy with justice. But so long as we are on the earth, bent under the burden of the mortal body, let us hold firmly the teaching of Catholic doctrine—that there is but one God, one Faith, one Baptism. To penetrate beyond this is not lawful. For the rest, let us pour out before God, as charity requires, incessant prayers that all the world may be converted to Christ; let us labour as far as in us lies for the salvation of all men. The arm of the Lord is not shortened, and the gift of heavenly grace will not fail those who sincerely desire and pray for the help of this light. These truths should be profoundly engraved on the mind of the faithful, so that they may not allow themselves to be corrupted by false doctrines, whose end is the propagation of indifference in the matter of religion, an indifference which we behold increasing and extending on all sides to the eternal ruin of souls.”*

Why we should labour for England's Conversion.

I have dwelt at length on the necessity of belonging to the one true Church, because the stringency and the measure of this necessity is clearly the measure and the stringency of the charity which should urge and spur us on to obtain for our fellow countrymen the priceless blessing of the true Faith. No charity is more popular with Englishmen than to man a life-boat that shall brave the storm to rescue from death the gallant fellows who have been shipwrecked on our coasts. Our aim is similar. It is to rescue those who, with no fault of their own, are foundering in unsound ships, or have been

* *Singulari quadam*, 9 Dec., 1854.

wrecked in the wild tempest of error which rages round us.

It is needless, at this moment, to urge that we are pledged by every motive of gratitude, loyalty, and devotion to our Divine Redeemer, to do everything within our power to spread His Name, and to extend throughout the earth His Kingdom, which is His Church.

Another Motive.

But we are encouraged to labour, for the conversion of England especially, by another motive, as honourable to our countrymen as it is reasonable and persuasive in itself. This English-speaking race has been endowed by God with certain natural virtues and qualities, by aid of which it has built up the stupendous colossus of the British Empire. This race, so prolific by nature, so enterprising in character, so steady in colonizing and filling up the vacant regions of the earth, so law-abiding by instinct and discipline, so imperial in dominion and control, so sympathetic and reasonable in its dealing with human nature—in spite of atrocities which have disgraced and still disgrace our name—this English race has been able to settle down among all kinds of peoples abroad, and to govern them with the smallest appeal to physical strength and the largest trust in the efficacy of moral force and common sense.

If, then, by the power and condescending love of God, this imperial race should be permeated by the supernatural principles of Faith, and enlisted by conviction into the service of the Church, how wondrously its influence would tell in the propagation of the Kingdom of Christ!

St. Leo says that the mighty structure of the Roman Empire was raised up by God in order to become a medium for the spread of Christianity in the beginning. And there is no reason why God may not use in like manner, if it should so please Him, in these latter days of the world, the great British Empire for something nobler than the spread of commerce and human industry,

—for nothing less than the spread of His Name, the extension of the kingdom of His Church, and the salvation of the world.

England's Conversion no Dream.

I hear some one whisper: "You are dreaming, you are raving. To talk of the conversion of England is childish babble. You are not two out of 27 millions of the population. You lose thousands of your poor through the workhouse system and proselytism for hundreds you gain in the upper classes. You misunderstand the English race, you misread their strong Protestant character, if you expect their conversion to Catholicism."

To this I reply: Compare the attitude of England during the last 300 years towards the Catholic Church with her attitude towards her to-day.

The Penal Times.

For 300 years Catholics were socially and civilly proscribed. They lived, or rather groaned, under all manner of disabilities. It was a crime to profess the Catholic religion, to hear Mass, to harbour a priest, to possess beads or medals blessed by the Pope, to communicate with Rome, to perform any act of the Catholic religion. The legal penalties were fines, confiscation, imprisonment, banishment, torture, and death, and they were applied with a remorseless hand.

No Catholic could hold a commission of the peace, a commission in the army or navy, or any civil position of trust and responsibility. Catholic education was proscribed, so that the children of Catholics had to grow up in ignorance, or to pass the seas if they would obtain education. Even the fathers of men now living remember the time when the only safe way for a Catholic to retain his estates was by legally conveying them to a Protestant, and when a Catholic could be compelled by any stranger on the road to give up his horse for a five-

pound note. Not only were the laws of the land directed against Catholics, but for nigh three centuries the whole literature and the social and public life of the country seemed to combine with the legislature for their degradation and utter extinction.

English Catholics To-day.

But what is the attitude of England towards Catholics to-day? They are in honour equal with their fellow-countrymen. They fill all posts of trust and honour, save only the highest; they are Viceroys, Governors of Colonies, Lord Lieutenants, Privy Councillors, Members of Parliament, Cabinet Ministers, Chairmen of County Councils, and Magistrates: they are Generals in the army, Admirals of the fleet, Judges of the land. There is no path of public or civil service which is not now open to them, and in which they are not welcomed. Once and again there has been a brief outburst of the old Protestant fear and bigotry, as happened 40 years ago, when, as a Protestant contemporary writes, "Liberals and Conservatives vied with one another in uttering furious nonsense, and the whole heart of the nation went with them. But the legislative result was a miserable penal law which was never put in force, and was repealed a few years ago with every expression of contempt."

Now put this change down to whatever cause you please—to communication with the Continent, contact with Catholics, the abolition of class privileges and ascendancy, indifference in matters of religion, the spread of education among all sections of the people, the decay of prejudice, critical research which is causing the history of England to be rewritten—whatever the cause, the result, the change, is undeniable.

Change in the Establishment.

Nor is this all. Not only has the attitude of the population changed, but the very Establishment which was set up in rivalry to the Church, with a Royal

Supremacy triumphantly pitted against a Papal Supremacy—this very Establishment has changed its temper and attitude. Its bishops, ministers, and people are busily engaged in ignoring or denouncing those very Articles which were drawn up to be their eternal protest against the Old Religion. The sacramental power of Orders, the need of Jurisdiction, the Real Presence, the Daily Sacrifice, auricular Confession, Prayers and Offices for the Dead, belief in Purgatory, the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, religious vows and the institution of monks and nuns—the very doctrines stamped by the 39 Articles as fond fables and blasphemous deceits—all these are now openly taught from a thousand pulpits within the Establishment, and as heartily embraced by as many crowded congregations. The image of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been put up with honour over the principal side entrance to Westminster Abbey, and the Queen of Heaven has been recently enthroned under the great dome of St. Paul's.

Though there be 60,000 ministers and preachers throughout the land pledged by their profession to denounce the Catholic Church, we find the Archbishop of Canterbury claiming with eager jealousy Catholic descent, and continuity with the Church of St. Gregory, St. Augustine, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, and St. Edmund. Societies are formed, tracts and books are written, lectures are delivered all over the country, to prove to the people that the past three hundred years have been a dismal mistake, and that the Church of England after all is not Protestant, but the true hereditary Catholic Church and nothing less. Only the other day a Diocesan Inspector of a great Protestant diocese instructed the children of a school he was examining that they were all to call themselves Catholics and not Protestants: and the rector of the parish, on hearing of it with some little surprise, replied that he had not himself gone quite so far, but that he was perfectly prepared to follow suit.

In a word, Catholic doctrines and practices are being reinstated all over the land, and the old heresies cast

out. The arch has been turned, the keystone alone is wanting. When a sick man is in a crisis of suffering, we pray the more for him, because he is near to death or to a cure. The Church of England may not be so far off her crisis; pray that, when the State abandons her and the Royal Supremacy is withdrawn, she may return to the Supremacy of the Vicar of Christ.

England half-Catholicised.

Now I say of all this, that it is not we who have changed, it is England that has changed. England now allows that Catholicism promotes love of country, loyalty to the constitution, fidelity to the sovereign—that the Pope and the Church are everywhere guarantors of order and promoters of the best interests of humanity.

O you, then, who are so cautious, and who read the signs of the times so sadly, lift up your heads and open wide your eyes, and recognise the marvellous change! No impartial observer can contrast the England of the past with the England of to-day, without declaring that the mind and heart and policy of the country have swung at least half-way round towards the Catholic Church. While some of us have been straining our minds and hearts in one direction, shaking our heads and lamenting because the conversions are so few,—behold, the whole country has become half converted without observation. I do not say that half the people, or any considerable section of the people, are yet *converted*; but I say that the decay of prejudice, the advance of truth, the change in sentiment and policy and in faith and practice, justify us in saying that England is half converted from what she was during the last three centuries,—and this both within the Establishment and without. If the progression of change be at the same ratio during the next 60 years as during the past, before the end of another century England may be practically Catholic again. We must indeed be hard to please if, looking at the national movement as a whole, we are not satisfied with the pace at which prejudices are disappearing and light is spreading.

What is meant by England's Conversion?

One word of caution. When I speak of the conversion of England, I do not mean that materialists, rationalists, and various phases of heresy will cease to exist; but I mean that the Catholic Church will become the most conspicuous, the most respected, the most trusted by the people of England; that its adherents will be composed of great masses of the working, of the educated, and of the best classes of the population; that its teaching and influence as restraining men's passions and appetites, and as spiritualising and elevating their lives will be fully recognized and applauded by the nation; that Protestantism as a State system and a national religion will pass away, while the Old Church will continue to expand and to win the hearts of the people, until it becomes the great citadel of religious truth, standing alone amid the errors of materialism and unbelief. These are thoughts which encourage hope; and hope is essential to the sustained effort which we are bound to make.

Cause of England's Conversion.

Various causes have been suggested for the marvellous change or half-conversion which has been spoken of. But there is one cause, which has been the secret mainspring, working out the ultimate result. That hidden mainspring is the supernatural power of prayer. Prayer has been offered for the conversion of England ever since the revolt of the 16th century, with a fervour, a hopefulness, and a perseverance, which is without a parallel in any other country of Christendom.

History of Prayer for England's Conversion.

The conversion of no other nation has been the object of such constant and universal prayer. While persecution was raging in England under Elizabeth, Gregory XIII. was granting privileges and Indulgences, thereby "to animate, as was said, not only

the remnant of Catholics left in England, but *to stir up Catholics in other countries to pray for the conversion of England.*" In 1605, a writer said that "the same Indulgences for the same purpose have now been lately confirmed by him that sitteth on St. Peter's Chair." These were Indulgences which "they only do obtain that have *devoted themselves to the restoring of the Catholic faith in England, or labour any way in that cause, or do pray for England.*" There existed also a catalogue of favours called "the Indulgences of St. Charles Borromeo," probably because that Saint had obtained the grant of them for those who laboured and prayed for the Conversion of England. Both St. Charles and St. Philip exhibited a special interest in England, and did much to promote its return to the faith by their prayers and good works.

Not only did a constant stream of missionaries and martyrs flow towards England from the Colleges of Rome, Douai, Valladolid, and Lisbon, everywhere causing prayers for her conversion to spring up on their path, but prayer for her conversion spread over Catholic countries. Among those enlisted in this spiritual army were saints, and great servants of God, of whom some were endowed with gifts of prophecy. Thus, Padre Mancinelli, S.J., traversed Italy, Spain, Germany, Poland, Bohemia, Dalmatia, and Turkey as a missionary. For 30 years he had never omitted a single day to pray for the conversion of England. In 1608, after many days spent in prayer and fasting, he had a vision at the end of which he said that, "at last God, being pacified, will make use of England to do wonderful things for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith among the Mahometan and the heathen races; and He will further it with His most special assistance so as to fill the whole world with admiration; whence it will come to pass that many nations and peoples will come to congratulate England, as happened heretofore to Jerusalem and Rome: which things will be granted to that nation on account of the merits and graciousness in the sight of God of so many great and illustrious saints of that kingdom."

The Ven. Mariana de Escobar, the Foundress of the Reform of the Recollects in Spain, had a vision in 1618 in which our Lord asked her which of the provinces that had apostatised she wished to bring back to the faith.—“I said, England, O Lord. The Lord then told me that that province had not the necessary dispositions, but nevertheless it will take place, only not in this age, but in another. I complained to His Majesty that He often spoke to me thus obscurely, and He answered that it is not fitting I should see all the things which He tells me of, but that what He had said about England would happen—that it would convert itself to the Lord in future times, not signifying when.”

In Germany, the Ven. Bartholomew Holzhauser, the reformer of the secular clergy in the 17th century, prophesied that the kingdom of England would return to the Roman Catholic faith, and that the English on their return would achieve more for the Church than on their first conversion to Christianity. Again, he says of England: “I saw a ship sailing on the sea, and arrive in port; and holy men who were in the ship landed, and they preached the Gospel. They prospered, and the land returned to peace and to the sanctification of Jesus Christ.”

The Ven. F. de la Colombière came to England from France in 1676. He was said to have received marvellous graces from God, and he lived the life of a saint. Here are his words about England: “O England, upon what country in days of yore did Heaven more abundantly shower its blessings, to what people was ever given greater zeal for the faith, deeper reverence for the Church? Thy cities have brought forth martyrs, thy churches pontiffs of extraordinary piety. I will not dwell on the honours received by the Mother of God at the hands of Englishmen in other days, nor speak of their devotion to the Queen of Angels, so great that England in those days was called the portion or dowry of Mary. Thou wast the first to raise the standard of the Immaculate Conception, to thee was given that miraculous scapular venerated by all Christians. *I*

have the highest hopes for the advance of the good cause in times to come. Shouldst Thou restore this people, O Lord, to the fold of Thy Church, Thou wilt find among them many true and generous hearts, there to glorify as in the past days Thy adorable Name."

But by far the most interesting and the most encouraging incitement to labour and pray for the conversion of England is one which belongs, as it were, to our own day. God is gathering together His spiritual forces and directing them upon England. Not only is He moving individuals; He is drawing them into congregations and confraternities.

St. Paul of the Cross.

Especially noteworthy is the foundation, by St. Paul of the Cross, of the Congregation of the Holy Cross and Passion, and its close connection with England. When the Saint, in the last century, was drawing up his Rule at Castellazzo, during a forty days' fast, and amid supernatural trials and visitations which recall the life of St. Ignatius at Manresa, the Lord suddenly forced upon his mind, as he knelt before the tabernacle, a vision of England. He beheld England, once an island of saints, then covered with mists of error and heresy. He could think of nothing else; his spirit was overborne by a pious impulse to pray continually to his Crucified Redeemer for the conversion of England. This inspiration, this prayer, this yearning desire after the conversion of England, was part of the spirit animating the Saint as he drew up the letter of his Rule. It is not surprising therefore that daily prayer for England's conversion has since become a rule and practice throughout his Congregation.

"Ah, England, England," he used to exclaim to his brethren, while tears flowed down his cheeks, "let us pray for England. *I cannot help praying for that country;* for as soon as I kneel down the thought of that poor kingdom forces itself upon me; and it is now over 50 years that I pray continually for its conversion." Again

he would often break out into such words as these: "What may be God's designs towards England, I know not. Does He intend to have pity on her? Will He one day bring her back to the Faith? Let us *pray*, and leave the rest to God."

One day, when confined to his bed by illness, the lay-brother came in with food, but found him absorbed in ecstasy. On returning to himself, he exclaimed with sadness and love: "O, where have I been? I have been in spirit in England and contemplating her glorious martyrs. Ah, how I have prayed for that country!" On another occasion, while saying Mass, and pouring out tears and prayers for England's conversion, behold, our Crucified Lord appeared to him, and drew a veil to let him see into the future of England. He was cheered and filled with joy and brightness by the sight. What were the details that he had seen he never made known, except this one, that he had beheld a multitude of his Religious labouring throughout England.

Father Dominic, the Passionist.

I must not pass over the life of that extraordinary man known among us as the Passionist, Father Dominic.

From his fourteenth year he was miraculously called by God to become an Apostle for the conversion of England. A poor, ungainly peasant, with nothing in manner or appearance to recommend him, was raised up by the very hand of God and His Blessed Mother, and wonderfully prepared for his apostolate to England. While still an uneducated peasant boy, he had many strange visions and intimations to pray for the conversion of souls.

Here is an extract from a private paper which he wrote in 1844:—

"At the end of 1813, during the Christmas time, I was one night alone, about 9 o'clock, on my knees in my poor little room, praying as I think fervently to God for the wants of the Church, when I suddenly heard, with most perfect distinctness, an interior voice, which could only be understood by one who heard it, and it said, with

formed words which I could not doubt, that I was destined to preach the Gospel and to lead wanderers back into the way of salvation. I remained as it were stunned by the announcement, not seeing how it could come about. I could not doubt but that the voice was from God and that He would fulfil His own designs. At that time I had had no education, I knew no Latin and had no opportunity for study."

Some months after this he entered the Passionists, to be a lay-brother. He writes of the year 1814: "About the end of September or the beginning of October, one day while the Religious were at table I went into the Church for a few moments to pray before the altar of the Blessed Virgin. I began to think how the intimation which had come to me at Christmas could be accomplished, and I pictured to myself China and America as mission fields. All of a sudden I understood in the clearest possible way, not by words spoken or heard but in a manner no one can understand who has not experienced it, that I was not to remain a lay-brother, that I was to study, that after six years I should enter on the ministry, and that my mission was to be in England—but I understood nothing of the time or the manner when my mission was to be accomplished. I remained more persuaded of the truth and reality of this Divine intimation than I am of my own existence."

From the day of this vision in 1814 he never ceased day or night to pray for the Conversion of England.

Finally he became a priest. He was then employed either in teaching or in preaching and giving missions and retreats up and down Italy. But one thing he did wherever he went, and that was to beg for prayers for England. In all his letters to religious and nuns he asked for prayers; if he heard of any soul remarkable for sanctity, he at once wrote to implore her prayers. Often when thinking and speaking of the loss of souls in England, he became agitated all over, and almost fainted with grief and emotion. He wanted the whole Church to unite in prayer for England. Writing to Mr. de Lisle, he said, "I try to find as many persons as I can of both

sexes, of whatever condition, especially the devout, to unite them in prayer for England. I never write a letter to religious or to nuns without asking prayers for England, and they all promise me their prayers. This fills me with consolation and the hope of this kingdom returning to the faith. This is God's work; and we must let God act, we following in the loving ways which the Divine majesty points out to us."

I myself well remember, when making the Spiritual Exercises in the Passionist Retreat near Lucca, before my ordination in 1854, how the superiors used to narrate to me accounts of Fr. Dominic's zeal for the conversion of England while he was Rector of that Retreat. He would make the community kneel down upon the palms of their hands upon the flags, and thus recite five *Paters*, *Aves*, and *Glorias* for the conversion of England, and when they were said, he would begin again, and then urgently implore them to say them once more in the same painful position, for so grand an intention.

Finally, after 27 years of patient waiting and of an Apostolate of prayer for England throughout Italy, Fr. Dominic landed in England, and, at the invitation of Dr. Wiseman, went at once to Oscott. In 1841 he made the first Passionist foundation at Aston, near Stone. He went through extraordinary trials. The rest I pass over—it is too well known; though I cannot omit mention of the crowning act of his apostolate to England which took place on that memorable night of the 9th Oct., 1845. After a long cold journey, Father Dominic reached Littlemore, drenched to the skin by a heavy and continuous rain, to receive John Henry Newman, the leader of the Tractarian party, into the Church. It was nearly midnight when he reached the door; he was received with gentle kindness, and then almost at once, even while he was drying his soaked clothing before the fire, Newman fell upon his knees before the man of God, and most humbly asked leave to begin his confession without any delay and to be received into the Church. There and then he began his general confession. The next day the holy man administered conditional bap-

tism, and received the great Tractarian, together with two other clergymen, Richard Stanton and John Bowles, into the bosom of the Church. Their Anglican domestic oratory was then blessed and turned into a Catholic Chapel: and Fr. Dominic next morning said Mass in it and communicated the new converts. Within three months of that day sixty Anglican ministers submitted to the Church.

Father Ignatius Spencer.

Closely connected with Fr. Dominic, both by apostolic zeal for England and by the ties of the same religious Institute, was the Hon. George Spencer, commonly known as Father Ignatius Spencer. In 1831 George Spencer went to Rome, after his conversion; and there he and Ambrose de Lisle made the acquaintance of Father Dominic. The conversion of England, and prayers for this object, were the constant subject of their conversations.

The year after, Spencer was ordained priest and returned to England. "Keep England (he wrote to his friend Mr. de Lisle) always next your heart. It is no small matter to overturn a dynasty so settled and rooted as that of error in this country. And how can we possibly expect to become instruments to effect this unless we become in some measure conformable to the character of the Saints who have done such things before us? Let us not give up the undertaking; for no one has succeeded without wonderful labour and patience, and none has ever failed when the undertaking has been duly followed up. Let us not be discouraged by opposition, but work the more earnestly."

It was in 1838 that he was launched on the work of his life, the Association of Prayers for the Conversion of England, by Mgr. Quélin, Archbishop of Paris.

In a letter to Bishop Briggs, dated Nov. 5th, 1838, he wrote as follows:—

"In the first visit which I paid to the Archbishop on my arrival in Paris, I was saying what I say continually,

that what we want above all in England is good prayers: and that it would be a great benefit if the French would undertake to unite in prayer for us. I did not think of making any proposal for an actual arrangement of the kind till the Archbishop himself encouraged, and almost obliged, me to do all I could, by the zealous manner in which he took up the idea. He appointed that I should meet him two days after at St. Sulpice, where 70 or 80 of the clergy of Paris were to meet him. He introduced me to them, and proposed that they should undertake to pray for the conversion of England on every Thursday. The proposal was most favourably received, and I heard of many offering their Mass on the first Thursday. I obtained a circular letter to the Superiors of religious houses. All of them undertook to offer their prayers, and to write to their sister houses throughout France.

“The General of the Lazarists and the Provincial of the Jesuits undertook to recommend it to their brethren, and all the Archbishops and Bishops whom I could meet promised to recommend prayers in their dioceses and provinces.”

Cardinal Wiseman.

Father Spencer traversed a great part of Europe—France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, and Italy,—everywhere imploring prayers for England. He was not alone in this instinct which pointed to the need of special and earnest recourse to God for England's return to the faith. Bishop Briggs had been leading the students at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, into the same path of zealous prayer for the Conversion of England. Then again there was the distinguished Rector of the English College in Rome, destined to play so remarkable a part in England as the first Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Wiseman. He also was intent on the same object, and he too placed his chief reliance on the power of prayer.

Here is an extract from his reply to Father Spencer,

who had written to inform him of his work upon the Continent, and of his plan to get all priests to offer Mass every Thursday for the Conversion of England. The letter is dated Ash Wednesday, 1839:—

“The subject of your interesting letter is one which has long occupied my thoughts, though I never contemplated the possibility of enlisting foreign Churches in prayer for the conversion of England, but turned my attention more to exciting a spirit of prayer among ourselves.

“In our Conference this time last year, I spoke very strongly to the students upon the wants of England, and the necessity of a new system in many things. One of the points on which I insisted was the want of *systematic prayer for the conversion of England*, and, at the same time, of *reparation* for her defection. I observed that it is the only country which has *persisted in and renewed in every generation formal acts of apostacy*, exacting from every sovereign, in the name of the nation, specific declarations that certain Catholic truths are *superstitious and idolatrous*. This therefore assumes the form of a national sin of blasphemy and heresy. It calls for contrary acts, as explicit and as formal, to remove its bad effects. Now, what are the points on which this blasphemous repetition of national apostacy has fastened? They are chiefly two: Transubstantiation and the worship of the Blessed Virgin. These consequently are the points towards which the devotion of Catholics should be directed in England. I inculcate this two-fold devotion to the students on every occasion. I have for a year made it my daily prayer that I might be instrumental in bringing back devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, its daily celebration, frequent Communion and *public* worship in England; and at the same time devotion to the Blessed Virgin, chiefly through the propagation of the Rosary. The idea struck me one afternoon that I happened to be alone in the Church of St. Eustachio, observing that the Altar of the Sacrament was that of the Madonna; this led me to earnestly praying on the subject of uniting those two objects in a common devotion in

England, and offering myself to promote it. Several things led me to feel strongly on the subject, which being trifles to others if not to myself, I omit. [After detailing his plans for daily Masses for the Conversion of England and for the *Quarant'Ore*, making the circuit of England throughout the year, and for Confraternities of the Rosary, which should have fixed days for the devotion, Saturday being the general day for all, he humbly adds these words.] So far as to my views and ideas before your better ones reached me, and I willingly resign all my views and intentions in favour of yours. Now as to what is doing here.

"On the Feast of St. Thomas we distributed to all the Cardinals that came a copy of your sermon received that morning. Cardinal Orioli declared that he had for years made a memento for England in his Mass, and Cardinal Giustiniani told me the other day that every Thursday he offers up Mass for its conversion. . .

"To show you to what an extent the pious practice is spreading, the Austrian Ambassador told me the other evening that his little boys (about seven and eight years old) prayed every Thursday morning for the conversion of England, and that having been asked by their mother on that day if he had prayed for it, one of the little fellows replied, 'No, Mamma; it is not Thursday.' Surely God must intend to grant a mercy when He stirs up so many to pray for it, and that, too, persons having no connection with the object, except by zeal or charity.

"I am going in a day or two, to consult with Pallotti as to the best means of propagating this new devotion, both in communities and among the people. I perfectly approve of enlarging your original plan so as to embrace all that are in error.

"I am in favour of giving *expansion* to charities in any way, and *Catholicising* our feelings as much as our faith. We are too insular in England, in religion as in social ideas. I am endeavouring to excite in the students the missionary spirit. By the missionary spirit I do not mean merely a parochial, but an apostolic, spirit, where

each one, besides his own special flock, takes an interest in and exerts himself for the benefit of the entire country, according to the gifts he has received."

Meanwhile prayer was producing its results in England. Bishop Walsh confirmed 600 converts in one year. The Tractarian movement was advancing. The Catholic faith was more and more occupying men's minds.

The Apostolate of Prayer.

In 1842, Father Ignatius visited Ireland for the first time. "If I could induce the Irish to pray for England," he said, "prayer springing from such charity would be irresistible." He enlisted hundreds and thousands of the zealous Irish people in his Apostolate of Prayer. The Irish Bishops encouraged him. Holy souls bound themselves by vow to pray for this object. The Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin, Bishops in Holland, Germany, and elsewhere took up the apostolate with zeal.

Father Ignatius obtained a Plenary Indulgence from Pius IX.: to be gained once a month for saying Three Hail Marys for England's conversion, adding to each Hail Mary, "Help of Christians, pray for us."

Besides this, 300 days' Indulgence were granted for one Hail Mary said for the same intention.*

It is impossible to realize the magnitude of the work of supernatural faith and charity accomplished by Fr. Ignatius. Suffice it to say that for 27 years he

* In one of his letters Fr. Ignatius writes :—

"I only ask now *one Hail Mary* a day to be said by every Catholic for the conversion of England. Here is a great field to work upon. Why not take up this object, and in every letter you write abroad or at home make people promise to do this, and make every man, woman, and child do it too. If millions would do as much as this, we should have thousands who would offer themselves up as victims to be immolated for the object, and we should have grand results. Above all, *let it be done in schools at home*; so that all the young men be trained to pant for the object as young Hannibal for the destruction of Rome; and a foundation will be laid for the work to go on after we are all dead, if no fruit appears before."

carried on his noble and disinterested Apostolate, till he laid down his life with his hand still on the work in 1864.* A few days before we lost him he was able to write as follows:—

“What have we seen in our days? Conversions to the faith so numerous and important that the whole world speaks of them. And this movement towards Catholicism is of a character so remarkable, that the history of the Church presents nothing like it.

“A first step has been made in this country, which, as far as I know, has no parallel. In other cases it was the sovereign who made the first movement, having had no learned opposition or persecution from his subjects, as in the instance of St. Stephen of Hungary, where conversions came easily and naturally; or conversion began with the poor who, though it cost them persecution and privation, had yet but little to lose. But this has not been the case in England. Here the work of conversion grew conspicuous among the ministers of the Protestant Church, of whom hundreds of the most esteemed and learned have been received into the Church, and also among the noble and gentle families of the kingdom. So that it may be said that scarcely

* Father Ignatius used to say that everything can be obtained from God by *Hail Marys*. If any one thinks this devotion to the Blessed Virgin strange or fanciful, I would beg of him to read the second part, p. 79. of Blessed Grignon de Montfort's golden treatise called *True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin*.

The characteristic of Father Ignatius as an Apostle was his wonderful charity. He was full of pity, because, as he was always saying *that the people had been deceived and robbed of their Faith*.” He was persuaded that souls are won to God by sympathy and love; that men are not convinced by angry, biting or caustic words. To work like him for souls, meditate well St. Paul's instruction on Charity (1 Cor. c. xiii.) It will act upon your soul like a new revelation. It will incite you to take up his work, and then to persevere in it.

Father Ignatius's great devotions were to the Mass and to the Blessed Virgin,—he was a great reader of Holy Scripture. His spirit of continual thanksgiving never forsook him: it was like a sun ever shining; *Deo gratias* was ever in his heart and on his lips. What a power this spirit of thanksgiving wins for the soul! It wins for us happy brightness, and the grace of perseverance.

is there a family that is not touched by conversion, in some near or more distant member of it.

"I say that this order of conversion is new, this operation of grace is most singular. Great numbers had prospects before them by remaining in Protestantism, flattering enough of earthly felicity, wealth and honour; and by their conversion they fell upon poverty, distress and contempt—and that in a country like this, where the world holds out allurements so specious and so attractive in every kind.

"But these great results can neither be attributed to the force, the eloquence, or the industry of man. *Man has positively had no part in the work, except by prayer*, and this praying has been professedly offered up to God through Mary; through whom all the heresies of the world are destroyed."*

* The following words were spoken by the late Bishop of Birmingham at Father Ignatius's funeral:—

"Many had been the questionings in many hearts, as to whether this country would ever in any serious numbers return to the faith or not. And many had been the speculations as to how this could be accomplished. Some dreamt it must come by missions; others, by learned writings; others, by the preaching of the Gospel; some had one scheme, some had another; but in each there was something defective, something not altogether divine; something that was human, and resting more or less on the will of man. But Fr. Ignatius consulted the light and grace of his own soul, he penetrated to the true principle, he recalled his own history, he saw that conversion is the work of God, that the work itself is the work of grace, and that all that man can do, is to invoke God to put forth His power. Prayer that is pure, sincere, earnest, of many souls, God always hears and inclines to grant. There are many ways of approaching to God; but there is one which He loves for its tender alliance with the Divine Humanity, for its humility and beautiful faith, and that is the approach through her who is at once the Virgin Mother of God and our Mother. Let us plead to God through the Mother of God, and let her plead for her sons on earth to her Son in Heaven, and behold our prayer is tripled in its strength. So Ignatius looked to God through the eyes of Mary, prayed to God through the heart of Mary, and appealed through the purity of Mary for a people who had forgotten her. . . He went on nourishing the flame which he had enkindled and stirring the zeal of his brethren until, to use his own words, often repeated to his superiors, this prayer, and the preaching of this prayer to God through Mary, had become a part of his nature, an element inseparable from his existence."

The Work of Prayer.

Surely it is impossible to impress too deeply on our own souls, in these days of activity, that prayer must be the principal instrument in the conversion of England. The Apostles gave themselves up to "prayer and preaching." No human activity, no human controversy, no human persuasion, is capable of converting a soul to the Faith. Experience teaches this. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." But it is equally certain that "no man cometh to Me unless the Father draw him."

Let the Catholic Truth Society then multiply her activities and her industries, and establish a depôt in every mission. "Preach the Word, be instant in season and out of season; reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine." Let us make the widest use we can of our powers of speech and of the press. But remember that the Catholic Church herself, though commissioned to preach, and endowed with Divine authority and infallibility, openly confesses that, with all her knowledge and experience, with all her bishops and religious orders, she is unable by her own unaided strength, to convert a single soul. She defined this truth to be of faith in that canon of the Council of Trent, which says:—"If any one say, that without the prevenient inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and without His help, man can believe, hope, love or repent, as he ought, . . . let him be anathema." (Sess. vi. can. 3.)

The Church is represented by Martha and Mary, activity and prayer; the former indeed is commendable and to be zealously employed, but the latter is "the one thing necessary," because the nearer to God, the more pleasing to Him, and therefore the more effectual.

St. Augustine brings this truth out with great force when he says that "the Church never ceases to pray that unbelievers may receive the gift of Faith. But were she to ask this gift of God, believing that she has herself the power to bestow it, her prayers would be insincere and worthless, which God forbid. For who would

sincerely pray to obtain from God as a gift, that which he believed he could obtain by himself, without God?" (De Dono Persev. c. xxiii).

St. John Chrysostom teaches the same. "Formerly," he says, "one person sufficed to convert many towns and cities; now-a-days many persons are unequal to the conversion of a single village. The reason of this is at hand: they are full of activities, but they pray little and coldly, hence no conversions."

While the hands of Moses were held up in prayer, the Israelites advanced; when they were lowered, the Israelites fell back. The great missionary Saints spent more time in prayer than in preaching. St. Teresa in her cell is said by her prayers to have converted more of the Indians of Mexico than all the missionaries of Spain. "Ask of Me, (that is, pray,) and I will give to thee the nations for thy inheritance."

Finally, the more we examine the change and the conversions which have occurred, the more we shall be forced to confess with Father Ignatius, that they have been the *WORK OF PRAYER*.

To say nothing of the gradual national change, which has cost men nothing, look at the conversion, during the last 50 years, of 550 clergymen and ministers who threw up every worldly prospect: of thousands of hard-headed professional men of business, including 250 lawyers and physicians, and about 100 admirals, generals and field officers. What had all these to gain in this world by embracing an unpopular creed, save only disapproval and a passing distrust! Eldest sons deliberately facing disinheritance, tender maidens withstanding the storm of parents, feeling the door of their own home close behind them, and deliberately going out into the cold and darkness of the night, without friend or shelter, rather than be unfaithful to the call of Faith; all this can be explained by no mere human cause. It has been the work of grace, the triumph of prayer.

Multitudes have surrendered who had never spoken to a priest, never heard a Catholic sermon. But they had listened to a secret inward voice. People of all sorts—

men who were spendthrifts and debauchees, with scarcely a redeeming quality, and Magdalens with their baubles and vanities, have sought refuge in the Church as well as the grave clergyman, the gallant soldier, the sailor, the lawyer, the man of business. How has the choice fallen so strangely? Why have some been chosen, and others—apparently as good, as sincere, and better—left? It is the mystery of grace as in the beginning. “There shall be two men in one bed, the one shall be taken, the other shall be left: two women shall be grinding at the mill, the one shall be taken, the other shall be left: two men shall be in the field, the one shall be taken, the other shall be left.”

Prayer is the mysterious power that deals with the mystery of grace, and moves the Hand of God “to have mercy on whom He will have mercy.”

Revival of the Apostolate.

Since the death of Fr. Ignatius in 1864, the Apostolate of Prayer for the Conversion of England has languished—and this not without great detriment to souls.

A revival of his spirit is taking place. We are all assisting at it. An Apostolic work which depends for its life and continuity upon an individual is doomed to decay. To carry it on, a corporation, an organization, which does not die, is required. Thus we have seen with admiration the recent establishment of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom, numbering 13,000 members, with 758 priests who offer 2,300 Masses each year for the Conversion of England. Thus again the children of St. Paul of the Cross, who are pledged by their rule and their tradition to work incessantly for the Conversion of England, have solemnly determined to give new life and vigour to the Association for the Conversion of England, established by Fr. Ignatius. The Cardinal Archbishops and Bishops of England, in their recent annual meeting, determined to place themselves at the head of this movement, and have ordered that the “Litany of Intercession for the

Conversion of England" be recited or sung on the second Sunday of every month, before the Blessed Sacrament, in every church and chapel in the kingdom. They have moreover desired that every means shall be taken for re-establishing and spreading the Association founded by Fr. Ignatius for the Conversion of England.

In this matter the Catholic Truth Society will find its place as a powerful co-operator, by printing and distributing everywhere leaflets and tracts, which shall give understanding to the people on the subject, and enlist their whole heart as well as their mind, in the Apostolate of Prayer for England's conversion.

To sum up. I say with the Apostle—"Pray for one another that ye may be saved: for the continual prayer of a just man availeth much." And surely the prayers and tears of England's innumerable Saints and Martyrs will be heard at last. Surely the intercessions which have for centuries been made all over Europe for her conversion will be heard. Surely the daily sacrifices, which were offered up for her welfare by more than 10,000 French émigrés who were hospitably received and entertained, at the public expense, in London and Winchester, during the fury of the great French Revolution—surely these sacrifices will be acceptable. Surely the prayers of St. Paul of the Cross, of his sons Dominic and Ignatius, and of countless others enlisted in the same behalf throughout England, Ireland, Scotland and the Continent of Europe—surely these prayers *have availed*, and surely they will continue to prevail! "God will not permit the child of so many tears and prayers to perish."

Pray with faith, and await God's time with patience. We have witnessed His wonderful deeds in the past; they are as nothing to what we shall see in the future.

One word more: You may sometimes have observed a tantalising phenomenon in the weather, when prayers are offered, after a long and distressing drought. How you look out for the rain! First a few drops are observed to fall, and people say they think we shall soon have rain: then the sky clears again and becomes as hard as

before. After a while some heavy drops are felt, and then comes perhaps a gentle shower, which soon passes :—but the long prayed-for rain does not come. At last the clouds gather, and presently begins the steady soak, the long grateful down-pour, which seems to empty the clouds and to satisfy the thirsty soil. Now conversions, in answer to prayer, have been falling in drops during the whole of this century, with here and there, as in the forties and the fifties, a scud or passing shower. Now and then, we examine the signs of the times, we look for the gathering of the clouds and listen for the rustling of the wind,—and we are disappointed. Be patient ; the down-pour of conversions will yet come, so as to satisfy our most ardent desire—if only we persevere in the Apostolate of Prayer. “The continual prayer of the just man availeth much.” Elias *prayed*, and “behold the heavens grew dark with clouds and wind, and THERE FELL A GREAT RAIN.” (St. James v. : iii. Kings, xviii.)



Rome's Witness against Anglican Orders.

BY THE REV. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

A LITTLE Anglican pamphlet entitled, *Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders*,¹ is one of the most recent publications of the Church Defence Society. Its object is to show that the best Roman Catholic authorities have consistently rendered testimony to the validity of the "Episcopal Succession and Priesthood of the Church of England;" in other words, to the validity of Anglican Orders. A formidable array of Catholic names, including Popes, and Bishops, and Theologians, is cited, and under each some passage is quoted, or action imputed, which as they stand appear to lend colour to the contention. On the assumption that there is indeed so much and such valuable Catholic acknowledgment of Anglican Orders, it may well seem surprising that there should be so many among us who take an opposite line. But Mr. Butler's suggestion is that these are only persons of inferior information or charity, or even of inferior honesty:²

¹ *Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders: A Defence of the Episcopal Succession and Priesthood of the Church of England, founded on the testimony of the best Roman Catholic authorities.* By the Rev. Montagu R. Butler. London: Church Defence Institution, 1893.

² Pp. 1, 2.

persons, therefore, whose opinion may be safely disregarded.

It is natural that a tract arriving on such grounds at a conclusion so favourable to the Anglican position should be welcomed and widely read: natural also that Catholics on whose attention it is triumphantly pressed should desire to see a criticism of it from some one of their own writers. The present tract is written in answer to many such expressions of desire.

For the Anglican clergy generally we have always felt the genuine respect which is due to earnest, devoted, and well-intentioned men. Even when they write against the Catholic Church, although their misconceptions and consequent misstatements are frequently truly surprising, it is the exception (though there are such exceptions) if we are unable to believe that they write in perfect good faith. We should be very sorry, therefore, if the judgment we are compelled to pass on Mr. Butler's tract were to be taken as any intended reflection on the body to which he belongs. Rather we should like to include these among the readers to whom we appeal, when we venture to denounce Mr. Butler's tract as simply a work of fraud quite unworthy of their patronage. Of course this is a very serious view to take of a work coming from a minister of religion, and one which should only be made under a serious sense of responsibility. But readers must judge whether the facts are consistent with a more lenient view. To aid them in their judgment we will commence by collecting together some of the author's statements in which the fraud is at once palpable.

The following passage from the Appendix of *Cardinal Newman's Apologia* is quoted on page 8.

As to its [the Church of England's] possession of an Episcopal Succession from the times of the Apostles, well, it may have it, and if the Holy See ever so decided, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own.

In other words, the validity of Anglican Orders was in the Cardinal's judgment so incredible that nothing short of an express decision of the Holy See could induce him to bow his reason and believe it. And yet on these words Mr. Butler places the interpretation that Cardinal Newman at heart believed in Anglican Orders, and only withheld the expression of his belief because he was not permitted to give it.

The words which have been quoted convey the strong impression that Dr. Newman, after his secession, really suspected that to be true, in regard to Anglican ordinations, which he had received no personal sanction to admit.

At all events, Mr. Butler must have known that the Cardinal's *very next* sentence conveys a very strong impression that his personal belief was dead against the Orders. "But for myself," he goes on to say, "I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the forehead of a gaily attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it, for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts." Was it less than fraud so to stop the quotation as to omit these words, not to mention the omission to say that over and over again elsewhere Cardinal Newman had declared most unmistakably his disbelief in these Orders?

On page 44, *Father William Humphrey, S.J.*, is quoted as saying,

I do not defend the position [*i.e.*, the position of the Roman Church of England].¹ I do not think it defensible, inasmuch as I do not believe it to be true, that we represent the pre-Reformation Church of England in the sense of our being a continuation of that body. They [Anglicans] represent it, but in the manner I have mentioned. We are a *new mission* straight from Rome—the centre, the source, and ever-living well-spring of Christianity.²

On these words Mr. Butler comments as follows :

When it is considered that no Church authority in any true sense can exist without a continuity of Holy Orders, the expressions of Father Humphrey furnish a strong presumption that he believes the ordinations of the English Church to be at least valid.

This “strong presumption” would hardly have been recognized by his readers had Mr. Butler allowed them to know that in his very next page Father Humphrey says :

It is to me, my dear friend, the greatest consolation that they [the Anglican Orders] are absolutely invalid : and for this reason—were they valid, England would be probably at this moment under a curse : the guilt of sacrilege would rest upon her, and upon her children (p. 56),

namely, because of the treatment accorded by so many generations of Anglican clergy to their “consecrated elements.” Honesty should have also suggested to Mr. Butler to let his readers know in what sense Father Humphrey recognizes Anglicans to represent, and us English Catholics not to represent, the pre-

¹ These bracketed words are Mr. Butler's. Father Humphrey's entire book is precisely in defence of “the position of the Roman Church in England.”

² *The Divine Teacher*, p. 54.

Reformation Church of England. Father Humphrey had just said,

I admit, it [the Anglican Communion] does represent the pre-Reformation Church, but I distinguish ; it represents it as a corpse represents him who was once a living being.

Then follows the passage quoted by Mr. Butler. And almost immediately after the sentence quoted, he adds :

The Church of England is the dead branch hewn from the tree, and lying on the ground ; we are the new shoot from the parent stem, which has taken its place. In this sense we represent the ancient Church of England.

Dr. Lingard is likewise cited, on page 39, as a witness, and two pages are devoted to his "exposure of the dishonesty of opponents of the Anglican succession." *Dr. Lingard*, in his *History of England*,¹ and again in two letters, in August and September, to the *Birmingham Catholic Magazine* for 1834, maintains strongly the historical truth of Parker's consecration by Barlow and others, and says that it cannot honestly be denied that the entry in the Lambeth Register is genuine. If Mr. Butler had quoted *Lingard* merely for this, no objection need have been taken, though it would not have greatly served his cause. But he quotes *Lingard* as maintaining that the Orders are *valid*, and this although he knew well from Mr. Hutton,² and from Dr. F. G. Lee,³ if not from the *Birmingham Catholic Magazine* itself, that twice in his letters to that periodical, *Lingard* says distinctly that he is contending "only for the fact of his (Parker's) consecration, not for its validity."

¹ Vol. vii. pp. 262, 263, Edit. of 1844.

² *The Anglican Ministry*, p. 126.

³ *Validity of Anglican Orders*, pp. 187, 448.

On page 38 we have "the testimony of *Canon Estcourt*," and three dexterously selected extracts from his *Question of Anglican Ordinations*, are given in such a way as to suggest to an undiscerning reader that that work was ^{as} a defence of Anglican Orders instead of being the most powerful indictment against them. In the same way, on page 43, *Mr. Arthur Hutton*, another writer of a powerful book against these Orders, is cited as a witness in their favour. What these two writers state in the passages which Mr. Butler endeavours to misconstrue, is that the present Anglican Ordinal might possibly suffice to convey valid Orders if employed by Bishops of undoubted orthodoxy. They both add what Mr. Butler forgets to add, that the ambiguity of the Ordinal is such that when employed by Bishops as unorthodox as the consecrators of Parker, it was quite inadequate.

We put these instances, to which some others might be added, in the forefront, because in them the misrepresentation is so palpable. Let the reader judge how far a book which is capable of these is worthy of credence in its other statements. Our own testimony about the rest of the work is, that fraud is apparent everywhere. However, it is hardly worth while to pursue further this purely personal issue. It will be better to confine ourselves to the question whether Anglican Orders can command any Catholic testimony in their favour.

To this question the general answer is this. We must distinguish between the authoritative action of the Church, and the opinions of individual Catholics. Whether Anglican Orders are valid or not is a

question of fact rather than of doctrine, and even to this day there is nothing to prevent an individual Catholic, for instance a convert clergyman, from believing them to be valid. Accordingly some have had this belief, although their number is very small, and consists mostly of persons of an eccentric temperament. But Church authority has been consistent in its practical attitude to these Orders throughout. From the days of Queen Mary to the present time it has never wavered in ignoring them and ordaining afresh, whenever any one who had previously received them has applied to be admitted to her ministry. It is this latter proposition which is alone of any importance, and to this we shall devote the main portion of the present tract. Afterwards, and as a matter of minor consequence, we will inquire shortly whether Mr. Butler has not gone greatly beyond the facts in reckoning up the private opinions in favour of his Orders from among Catholic writers.

Have these Anglican Orders been at any time recognized by the authorities of the Catholic Church?

It will conduce to clearness if before examining Mr. Butler's witnesses we state briefly what is meant by Anglican Orders, and why we disallow their validity. The separation of England from the unity of the Catholic Church took place in 1534. Henry VIII. died in 1546, and was succeeded by his son, Edward VI. All this time Cranmer was a leading spirit among the so-called Reformers, and it is beyond dispute that Cranmer disliked greatly the Catholic doctrine of Holy Orders; that is to say, the doctrine that, through this sacrament, when rightly adminis-

tered, a mysterious gift is imparted to the recipient, whereby he becomes empowered to consecrate the Blessed Sacrament, and to perform the other sacramental acts proper to the Order to which he has been raised. Cranmer's own view was that bishops and priests are such by the appointment of Christian princes, that imposition of hands as an Apostolic rite is to be retained, but that it is only a ceremonious way of conveying his appointment to the recipient, and that no mystic power whatever is imparted thereby. As long as Henry was on the throne, Cranmer had to pocket his scruples and use the old Pontifical when he held his ordinations, and this Pontifical continued in use during the first three years of Edward VI. At length, in 1549, the Archbishop saw his way to overcome the intense opposition to his desire, and to substitute another Ordinal more according to his mind. A commission was appointed, nominally to devise the new service, but in reality to sign and sanction with some appearance of learned unanimity a service which Cranmer had already prepared. The new book became law in the spring of 1550. It omitted all the unctions, and the delivery of the vestments, and it introduced radical changes into the character of the prayers, not merely throughout the service, but even in the sacramental form. It retained imposition of hands, and till 1552, when it was further modified, the delivery of the chalice and paten, though without the words which indicated the sacrificial character of the priesthood.

By Anglican Orders then we mean those given according to this Ordinal. During the reign of

Edward only six episcopal consecrations belong to the category, those of Poynt, Hooper, Coverdale, Scory, Taylor, Harley; although Ferrar, consecrated in 1548, before it was drawn up, seems from Cranmer's register to have been by anticipation consecrated after its method. The ordinations to the priesthood during this short period are more difficult to calculate. Under Elizabeth this Edwardine Ordinal came into use again, and was used at the consecration of Archbishop Parker, a consecration which, if invalid, invalidates the entire Orders of the Anglican clergy, since they are all derived from it.

It is not necessary here to explain all the reasons for suspecting Parker's consecration. But the main reason may be usefully indicated, since its nature is so persistently misunderstood by Anglicans. It may be introduced by an illustration from a case of doubt about the validity of certain baptisms referred by St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, to Pope Zachary¹ in the eighth century. St. Boniface wrote to say that certain priests had administered baptisms with the form, "In nomine patria et filia et spirita sancta," and inquired² whether these baptisms were to be taken as valid or invalid. The Pope answers with a distinction. Was the perversion of the proper form due to an heretical intention on the part of the minister, or merely to his ignorance of Latin grammar? If the former, the baptisms were invalid;

¹ Pope Zachary's letter is in Mansi, *Conc.* xii. 325; and ap. Franzelin, *De Sacramentis in Genere*, p. 48.

² For the sake of readers who do not know Latin, it may be explained that the proper form is, "In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti" ("In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"); and that "patria" means country, "filia," daughter, whilst "spirita sancta," is gibberish.

if the latter, valid. The decision was according to common sense. When language is ambiguous, and as such susceptible of two or more meanings, men naturally recur to the mind of the speaker to determine which of the possible meanings he intended. Now in the Edwardine Ordinal extensive changes had been made in the old rite with the express object of eliminating the alleged Popish superstition that a mystic power over the sacraments is imparted, and of preserving only what was consistent with the Protestant doctrine of an appointment by purely human authority.¹ Anglicans maintain that whatever may have been the purpose of the compilers, their changes did not succeed in taking away the bare essentials of a valid rite. They left imposition of hands, and a form capable of bearing a Catholic construction. Let us grant that this is so, although the concession is very generous. Still the rite remains, to say the least, ambiguous, and the ambiguity must be determined by the opinions of those who authorized it and those who used it. The principle applied by Pope Zachary has its similar application here.

It is absurd to retort against this argument, that according to all Catholic theologians, even an heretical minister administers valid sacraments as long as he has a "general intention to do what the Church does through that sacrament;" for this principle applies only to cases where the matter and form employed are those sanctioned by the usage of the Catholic Church, or are at least free from ambiguity. If ambiguity has been introduced into the form, laying

¹ Estcourt, chap. vi. vii.

it open to an heretical construction, an heretical intention in the minister is for the reason given altogether fatal to validity.

We are now in a position to discuss Mr. Butler's cases of supposed recognition of Anglican Orders by Catholic ecclesiastical authority, and we will take them in order.

a. It is said, on page 6, that the *Council of Trent* "invited the English Bishops, as *Bishops*, to join in the deliberations of the Council;" and, "though its attention was directed to the affair, distinctly refused to pronounce the English Bishops to be no Bishops."

Ans. (1) Pius IV. does seem, and naturally, to have invited Elizabeth to send representatives to the Council of Trent (just as he also sent invitations to the other Protestant princes), but there is no proof that the invitation styled the Anglican "Bishops" by that name, and even if it had, such a designation would not imply that they were recognized as Bishops by consecration, or that they would have been allowed to sit as such. Their case would have been investigated, and the evidence considered. It is also not clear that at so early a date as 1561, the Pope knew the circumstances of the Elizabethan consecrations. It would have been more candid then of Mr. Butler to mention here (and elsewhere) that he was giving not a recognized fact, but merely his own interpretation of one. For a fuller account see Hutton,¹ whose convincing argument Mr. Butler finds it more convenient to ignore than to meet.

(2) It is possibly though not probably true, that

¹ Pp. 132, 134.

both Pope and Council declined expressly to condemn Anglican Orders, and it is certain that they declined at that time (1561) to excommunicate Elizabeth. But why is it not mentioned that the reason for declining whatever was declined was not any belief in the Orders, but fear of bringing down a heavy persecution on the English Catholics?¹

b. "The Irish Bishop, *O'Hart* of Achonry, asserted (at Trent) that on the score of not being appointed by the Pope, the English prelates were no true Bishops, but he added, 'We refute them by this reason only, for they show that they were called, elected, consecrated, and given mission.'"²

Ans. This also is a bubble which Mr. Hutton has effectually pricked.³ The Bishop of Achonry's speech was made in November, 1562, and at that date he also may not have known much about the facts of Parker's consecration. These facts, be it remembered, were kept so secret that the Catholics of England knew nothing of them till long after; and *O'Hart* was from the west of Ireland, where no consecration with the Edwardine Ordinal took place till two years later (1563). Probably, as Mr. Hutton shows, the Bishop had in mind the consecrations under Henry VIII.; for "the Bishop speaks distinctly of the King (not the Queen), and his words precisely describe the schismatical consecrations which took place under Henry VIII." *O'Hart's* argument is, that it is much easier to convince Anglicans of the falseness of their position if jurisdiction is derived immediately from the Pope, than if immediately from God: because then one can shelve the argument they

¹ *Ibid.*

² P. 7.

³ Pp. 129, 130.

raise from their alleged consecration, confirmation, &c. For an argument like this it was of more consequence what Anglicans thought about their Orders, than what O'Hart himself thought.

c. At the head of Section iii.¹ we read, "*Julius III.* confirms Anglican Orders; *Paul IV.* reconfirms them"—a statement calculated to make a man rub his eyes with surprise. We are naturally curious to learn how the feat of proving it will be accomplished. Well, let us see :

On the 8th March, 1554, Pope *Julius III.* sent a Brief to Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, desiring him to absolve and reconcile Bishops and Priests made in Edward VI.'s time; but instead of telling him that they were to be reordained, His Holiness commanded the Cardinal to confirm them in the Anglican Orders which they had already received, and to reinstate them, "after by you they shall have been restored to the unity of Holy Mother Church, and you shall have thought good to reinstate them, if in other respects they shall be accounted by you to be worthy and fit." The Pope further specified that those who had received the Anglican consecration should be regarded as having had the "gift of consecration already bestowed."

And again :

Dr. Nicholas Sanders testifies that the Anglican Episcopal Orders which were officially recognized and confirmed under Papal authority by Cardinal Pole, received additional recognition from another occupant of the Holy See, for they were "established and confirmed afterwards by the letters of Paul IV."

The reference given for this last statement is, "*De Schismate Anglicano*, lib. ii. Sanders."

Ans. It will be noticed that the phrase, "Anglican

¹ P. 8.

Orders," which occurs several times in these passages, always occurs outside the quotation marks. In other words, it is not Julius III. or Nicholas Sander, but Mr. Butler who says that the Orders to which the Popes accorded their recognition were Anglican Orders. This, again, is a point which has been carefully discussed by Canon Estcourt. Is it because Mr. Butler finds the Canon's arguments too convincing that he prefers to disregard them altogether and be content with stating his own extraordinary opinion as a recognized fact?

The Bull of Julius which alone touches on the question of Anglican Orders, is the second of the two sent to Pole, and bears date March 8th, 1554. It distinguishes the clergy appointed during the schism into two classes, "those who have *never* and those who have *improperly* (*male*) received Orders." It likewise distinguishes the Bishops appointed during this period into two classes, "those who have received and those who have not yet received the gift of consecration." In the case of those who have been validly consecrated, three possible cases are stated as those which he may require faculties to deal with: (1) Those who have been consecrated by heretical or schismatic Bishops, or (2) otherwise improperly (*minus rite*), or (3) without the accustomed form of the Church being preserved. Of course it is antecedently possible that the phrase, "without the accustomed form of the Church being preserved," may have been used in reference to Orders conferred by the Edwardine Ordinal. But it does not even then follow that the Pope recognized these Orders as valid. It only follows that he thought their validity

or invalidity was a matter which would require investigation. It is not likely that he would have wished to take an investigation of that kind upon himself; it is much more likely that he would have wished to leave it to Pole, who would conduct it on the spot. Thus the myth that Julius III. recognized Anglican Orders disappears.

d. But Mr. Butler also claims *Paul IV.*, who succeeded Julius III., as recognizing these Edwardine Orders; and this on the authority of Sander, who is alleged to have said that Paul "confirmed all that had been done by Pole in execution of the orders received from Julius." It is doubtless true that Paul IV. confirmed Pole's action, and therefore we will not raise the objection that the statement, like that about Fisher taking the Oath of Supremacy,¹ does not come from Sander, who was a contemporary, but from his interpolator, who was not a contemporary. However, before we can gather any conclusion from the confirmation given by Paul IV. we must first ascertain what was done by Pole.

e. Here again Mr. Butler is very confident.

We may fairly cite *Reginald Pole*, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury, as on the side of those who have acknowledged Anglican Orders. Acting under Papal authority, to which we have already referred, His Eminence *confirmed* "the gift of consecration already bestowed" in the case of English prelates. In the words of his own document he confirmed such persons *in suis ordinibus etiam ab hæreticis et schismaticis episcopis . . . per eos susceptis. . . .* It would be absurd to conjecture that Pole did not believe the ordinations, which he so confirmed, to be real. (p. 15.)

¹ On this point see the *Tablet*, Nov. 9 and 16, 1889, and *The Month*, Dec., 1889.

It will be noticed that here also there is nothing within the quotation marks to indicate that the Orders confirmed were "Anglican Orders," that is, Orders conferred by the Edwardine Ordinal. That these are the Orders referred to is, in fact, only an inference of Mr. Butler's; an inference, too, that would perhaps commend itself still less to the reader if Mr. Butler had allowed them to see the words which he has preferred to suppress. Let us supply the omission; and it will be better to give the passage in English. The document, by the bye, is not a confirmation at all. It is the grant of faculties from Pole to the Bishops to enable them to reconcile persons within their dioceses. In it he authorizes them to dispense with such persons "in every kind of irregularity contracted," . . . "and notwithstanding all such irregularity and other aforesaid impediments," to allow them to "minister in their Orders, even if these have been received from heretical and schismatical Bishops, even if unduly, *provided that the form and intention of the Church was preserved*" (in conferring them). The italicized words are those which Mr. Butler suppresses, substituting his dots in their place. And yet what these italicized words do is just to exclude the Anglican Orders, or Orders conferred by the Edwardine Ordinal. And they were manifestly inserted with the express purpose of excluding them. How are we to characterize such tampering with a quotation?

In fact, although the Pope left it to his discretion to deal with cases in which the usual form of the Church had not been fully observed, Pole in all his grants of rehabilitation is careful to insert the clause,

“provided the form and intention of the Church has been preserved.” Could we have a clearer proof that he judged after investigation that where the form of the Church had been departed from, the departure had been of such a character as to invalidate altogether the Orders conferred by it? There is not a single case of any one of the six Bishops made by the Edwardine Ordinal being continued in office by Pole, as Mr. Butler knows very well.

As for the clergy of the second order, it is more difficult to determine whether any of them were taken on or not after the re-establishment of the true faith. Although, therefore, we can be sure from the terms of the episcopal faculties that if any were taken on they must have been ordained afresh, yet we cannot appeal to any direct proof that such persons were ordained afresh. This much, however, we can say: Dr. Lee’s attempt to prove that some were taken on without reordination from the fact that there is no mention of reordination in the episcopal registers which have been searched for the purpose, proves nothing at all. It is not the custom in the Church to refer in the entry of an ordination to any previous inefficacious ceremony. In our own age many Anglican clergymen have after their conversion been promoted to Catholic Orders. In no case is it probable that any record of the previous Anglican ceremony would be found in our episcopal registers.

We are not, moreover, without some direct evidence that the same course was followed with the Edwardine priests and deacons as with the Edwardine Bishops. This evidence may be read in Canon Estcourt’s pages. Here it will be enough to say that

it falls under three heads : (1) That in the reign of Elizabeth, in his Visitation of 1561, Parkhurst, the Anglican Bishop of Norwich, inquired "whether any that took orders in King Edward's days, not contented with that, were ordained again in Queen Mary's days ;" (2) that during Mary's reign certain ecclesiastics are spoken of in dispensations, visitation articles, &c., as having administered sacraments during the schism without having been ordained priests, or as having "intruded into benefices under colour of priestly orders ;" (3) that in the ceremonial degradation of those condemned for heresy under Mary, Edwardine Orders were consistently left out of account. Thus Latimer and Ridley, who had been consecrated by the Pontifical, were degraded from the Episcopate ; Hooper and Ferrar, two "Anglican" Bishops, only from the priesthood. Bradford, an "Anglican" deacon, was treated as a layman, and not degraded at all. It has indeed been urged that Ridley, according to Foxe in one place, was only degraded from the priesthood. But this, as Estcourt shows, is a mistake, or misstatement, of Foxe, who elsewhere in three places gives us to understand that Ridley was accounted by his judges to be in true Episcopal Orders.

f. Bishop Bonner is another of Mr. Butler's witnesses.¹ He is alleged in his Visitation articles (1554) to "have allowed Anglican priests to say Mass, but desired that they should be 'reconciled' and 'admitted by the Ordinary' before they were permitted to continue the exercise of this function." He is also alleged to have recognized the episcopal

¹ P. 17.

consecration of Scory by calling him, "Our beloved brother John, late Bishop of Chichester," in a document dated July, 1554, rehabilitating Scory from the suspension incurred by taking a wife, and permitting him to "exercise the public functions of his ecclesiastical ministry and pastoral office."

Ans. It is a pity Mr. Butler could not find room to quote along with the article from Bonner's Visitation articles, the corresponding article among those sent by the Queen to Bonner in which it is said: "Touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any Orders after the new sort and fashion of Orders, *considering they were not ordered in very deed*, the Bishop of the diocese . . . may supply that thing which wanted in them before, and then, and according to his discretion, *admit* them to minister."¹ For this comparison of the two articles suggests that "admission" might involve "reordination." However we grant that Bonner might have spoken his mind, whatever it was, more clearly, both here and in his rehabilitation of Scory. The latter is restored to "the exercise of his ecclesiastical ministry and pastoral office." Such phraseology is of a decidedly Lutheran cast. Taken in a Catholic sense, a bishop's "pastoral office" is his episcopal *jurisdiction*, and Bonner could hardly have meant to accord Scory that in his own diocese of London. But it is sufficiently evident from the text of the grant and its circumstances that all granted was leave to hold and administer a parish in the diocese of London: and, as Scory had undoubtedly been validly ordained to the priesthood, such a grant raised no question of the validity of the

¹ Wilkins' *Concilia*, iv. 89.

Edwardine Ordinal. As for the term, "beloved brother," it is a mere term of social and legal significance, and proves nothing. Legally, it must be remembered, Scory had been Bishop of Chichester. What, however, is chiefly to be observed in regard to these acts of Bonner's, is that they were done in the first year of Mary, before Pole had arrived and apart from instructions or faculties received from him. If we grant that Bonner, who had joined in the schism so largely and had not as yet cleared up his ideas sufficiently on the theological question, did not distinguish between the two sorts of Orders, we are granting what will not avail Mr. Butler very much.¹ Canon Estcourt² quotes a passage from this prelate's Homilies, published in 1555, which makes it very clear that he had then come to regard Anglican Orders as of no value whatever.

g. h. j. Mr. Butler next claims as having given official recognition to Anglican Orders, the three Popes who were the next successors of Julius III. on the Papal throne: *Paul IV.* (for the second time), *Pius IV.*, *St. Pius V.*

"It is worthy of note that the Pontiff (Paul IV.) offered to confirm the English Book of Common Prayer," and "as an important part of the said book was the Ordinal of the Church of England," the offer "was a direct acknowledgment of the validity of Anglican Orders." Also "Lord Coke," writes Dr. Littledale, "stated that he had often heard that Pius IV. (Coke said Pius V.) had offered to accept the Book of Common Prayer: and that he had also

¹ Lee, *Validity of Anglican Orders*, App. p. 387; Estcourt, p. 38.

² P. 59.

frequently conferred with noblemen of the highest rank in the State, who had seen the Pope's letter." And Dr. E. L. Cutts records that "Pius V. acknowledged that the Book of Common Prayer 'contained nothing contrary to the truth, while it comprehended all that is necessary to salvation.'" ¹

Ans. For an able refutation of this curious Anglican myth the pages of Canon Estcourt² must be consulted. It is not surprising that Mr. Butler, who has read Canon Estcourt's chapter, should have felt it more prudent to drop no hint which could suggest its existence to his readers.

It will be sufficient here to set down a few facts which no one can possibly dispute, and which we take over from Canon Estcourt, having however first verified them. Coke, in the passage from his Norwich Charge (1606), which Mr. Butler mentions, names as the Pope who made the offer, Pius V.; and he is very distinct about the man, for he says it was the Pope "who presently excommunicated Elizabeth," and that certainly was Pius V. But Dr. Littledale quietly corrects Pius V. into Pius IV., whereas Dr. Cutts leaves the name of Pius V. unaltered. Mr. Butler then gives us Coke *per* Littledale, and Coke *per* Cutts, and by this simple expedient obtains two Papal witnesses instead of one. Paul IV. is also only another correction of Coke made by Dr. Robert Abbot, who says, "Coke was mistaken in saying Pius V. when he ought to have said Paul IV."

Coke and Abbot wrote some half-century after the alleged date of the offer. About the same time Andrewes and Camden also record the offer as

¹ Pp. 10, 11.

² Chap. viii.

having been made, but are not able to agree among themselves over essential particulars. When we go back to earlier authorities we find Father Parsons in his *Brief Discourse* saying in 1580, "Therefore that which hath been given out (as is said by some great men), that the Pope, by his letters to Her Majesty, did offer to confirm the service of England, upon condition that the title of supremacy might be restored to him again, is impossible to be so ; so that if any such letters came to Her Majesty's hands, they must needs be feigned and false." To this statement of Parsons, his Protestant opponents Fulke and Wyborne reply that they never heard of any such report. Wyborne says he "leaves to the authors that first invented such brabbles to occupy men's heads withal," to determine whether they be true or not.

In the face of these various and inconsistent statements, and the intrinsic incredibility of a Pope making any such offer, Canon Estcourt concluded that the whole story was concocted by Elizabeth and her counsellors. Pius IV. certainly did send two legates to the Queen in the hope of regaining her and her kingdom to the Catholic Church : Parpaglia in 1560, and Martinengo in 1561. Although neither of them was allowed to cross the Channel, the letter of accreditation carried by Parpaglia became public.¹ But this is the only letter from the Pope to the Queen of which there are any traces, and it contains nothing but an assurance that the Pope would do for her all in his power "for the salvation

¹ See Camden's *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 33, Edit. 1635 ; or Estcourt, p. 358.

of her soul," and the "establishing and confirming" of her "princely dignity." How then account for the very different account of the Papal offer, for the unquestionable truth of which Coke and others pledged their word? Was it not a natural inference that the Queen and her counsellors, who were by no means troubled with excessive candour, had seen in Parpaglia's embassy and letter an excellent nucleus out of which to construct a useful story, and induce Catholics to attend Protestant service by making them believe that the Pope had sanctioned it? So, at all events, it seemed to Canon Estcourt, and so, till quite recently, it seemed to ourselves.

But a further piece of evidence bearing on the subject, which, although not new, having been referred to by Mr. Crosbie in his Preface to the Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1559—1571,¹ had otherwise passed unnoticed, was pointed out by Mr. Bayfield Roberts in a letter to the *Guardian*, May 31, 1893. This additional evidence is, we understand, considered by Anglicans to place the reality of the Pope's alleged offer to sanction the Book of Common Prayer beyond doubt. Most unquestionably it does not do that; but it certainly revolutionizes all previous opinions on the nature of this curious history, and as it has not yet been discussed, it will be convenient to use the present opportunity of investigating its true value and significance.

Under the date June 21, 1571, Sir Francis Walsingham, the English ambassador at the French Court, wrote to Lord Burleigh an account of a

¹ P. xxxiii.

conversation held with the Queen Mother, Catherine de Medici. The subject was the projected marriage between Elizabeth and the Duc d'Anjou, afterwards Henry III. of France. Elizabeth and Charles IX. were at this moment both very desirous for political reasons that the marriage should come off, but the religious difficulty was raised, the Duc d'Anjou insisting that the free exercise of the Catholic faith should be permitted to him, and Walsingham, on the part of Elizabeth, representing that such a permission would be incompatible with the tranquillity of her realm. In his conversation with the Queen Mother, one of the arguments employed by Walsingham to induce Henry to forego this demand, was the self-same argument from the supposed Papal approval of the English Prayer Book which we have seen used by Coke and others some forty years later.

I showed her that sudden change [from Catholicism to Protestantism] was not required [of Anjou], the same being referred over to God whose office it is to change hearts, but only the forbearing of his Mass, and to content himself with the form of our prayers, whereof I showed him I had delivered a copy unto Monsieur de Foix,¹ which form of prayer, madam (quoth I), the Pope, as I am informed, would have by council confirmed as Catholic, so the Queen my mistress would have acknowledged the same as received from him.²

That Walsingham should have said as much to Catherine proves nothing. He was quite capable of telling her an untruth if it suited his purpose. But opposite the last clause of the passage there is this marginal note, in a different hand: "An offer made

¹ An ecclesiastic whom it was proposed to send over to England to conduct the marriage negotiations. ² *C.S.P. Foreign*, June 21, 1571.

by the Cardinal of Lorraine, as Sir Nicholas Throckmorton showed me." It is into the significance of this note that we have to inquire.

In the first place who wrote it? Mr. Bayfield Roberts in the *Guardian* takes it as Walsingham's. But it is not in Walsingham's handwriting, and could not well have emanated from him. Sir N. Throckmorton had been the ambassador to France from 1559 to the end of 1563, and any communication received from the Cardinal of Lorraine must have been made before the latter date. If received it would have been communicated as a fact of importance to Cecil, who could hardly have needed to be reminded of it eight years later by Walsingham. There is no necessity, however, for recourse to inference, as the handwriting of the note can be identified as that of one of Cecil's secretaries. It reappears in the endorsement of the document entitled "Prolongation of the Queen's Majesty's expenses."¹ Hence the note runs in Cecil's name.

We may start therefore from this historical certainty, that in June, 1571, Cecil believed that an offer of the kind stated had been made to Throckmorton by the Cardinal of Lorraine, and that it had been made between 1559 and 1563.

The first conclusion to be drawn from this is disastrous to the testimony of Coke and Abbot. It does not confirm, but overthrows what they avouch. For Abbot tells us that the Papal "*letter*" was well known amongst us as a subject often brought forward in Parliament, and mentioned by the Queen herself, . . . mentioned also in sermons in the Queen's

¹ May 31, 1571, *C.S.P.* n. 1755.

presence with an appeal to her as vouching for it :” and Coke says,

This is the truth concerning Pope Pius Quintus, as I have faith to God and men, as I have oftentimes heard it avowed by the late Queen in her own words : and I have conferred with some lords that were of greatest reckoning to the State, who had seen and read the *letter* which the Pope sent to that effect as have been by me specified. And this upon my credit, as I am an honest man, is most true.

Either Coke¹ and Abbot, or else their informants, have not shown themselves honest men ; for their point is that the offer was definitely made in a well-known letter, whereas it is clear from Cecil’s marginal note that no such letter existed. Had he known of evidence so much more definite and original he would have noted this and not merely “an offer from the Cardinal of Lorraine, as Sir N. Throckmorton showed me.”

A second conclusion from the marginal note must, it seems, be that Throckmorton did really receive from the Cardinal of Lorraine some communication which he construed into an offer that the Pope should “by council confirm” the Book of Common Prayer : and that Cecil likewise on receiving the news gave it credence. It is difficult to avoid this conclusion from the note, although no doubt it is strange that we should find no reference to the offer in the numerous letters from Throckmorton to Cecil which are preserved in the State Paper Office and catalogued in Father Stevenson’s Calendar. When

¹ Coke afterwards protested against the general incorrectness of the report of his charge, but it is unlikely that he had in view the language of this passage. At all events Anglicans have hitherto so reasoned. However, let him have the benefit of any doubt there may be.

we further inquire for the date of the "offer," it seems probable it was made in 1560 or 1561, possibly in 1562. At that time the Guises were in power, and it was still hoped on the Continent that Elizabeth might after all be reclaimed to the Church. Pius IV. was then sending over Parpaglia and Martinengo, and the Cardinal of Lorraine would have been anxious to forward their business. We know too of a conversation held with Throckmorton, out of which the "offer" might easily have grown. Recounting in June, 1561, an interview with Mary, Queen of Scots, when he had sought to attract her towards Protestantism, Throckmorton told her the "Cardinal had confessed to him that there were great errors and abuses come into the Church, and great disorders in the ministers and clergy, insomuch as he desired that there might be a reformation of both." Mary replied that "she had often heard him say the like."¹ The form also of the "offer" points to the same approximate date. "The Pope in council, as I am informed," says Walsingham, "would have confirmed" (the form of prayer). By "council" must be here meant the Council of Trent, which was to be resumed in the spring of 1562: for otherwise Walsingham was experienced enough to use the right phrase, "in consistory."

The "offer" then was really made, but what was its character and significance? Very little indeed. It is antecedently, as has been observed, a most inconceivable thing that a Pope should have offered to sanction the Book of Common Prayer, especially if

¹ Throckmorton to the Queen, June 13, 1561. *C.S.P.* n. 265.

we are to comprise in the designation the Communion Service, Ordinal, Articles, &c. We require therefore the most decisive evidence before lending credence to the story. An authenticated letter from a Pope making the offer in distinct terms would of course be evidence reaching this required standard, and the story as told by Coke and the others had the advantage that it took that form. But the existence of any such letter is now effectually disproved by Cecil's marginal note, and in its place we have left nothing but a personal offer from the Cardinal of Lorraine that the Pope should confirm the Prayer Book in the Council. Or rather we have not even that, but only Walsingham's, or at best Throckmorton's, impression that the "offer" amounted to this much. Mr. Crosbie, in his Preface already referred to, observes that the Cardinal was the Papal Legate in France, and suggests that the offer must therefore have emanated from Rome. But he was only, being Archbishop of Rheims, *legatus natus*, or what the Archbishops of Canterbury were before the Reformation: he was not *legatus a latere*. Any formal offer from the Pope would not have come through him, but through the Nuncio, the Bishop of Viterbo.

In short, the evidence we have points merely to something of this kind. Throckmorton had perhaps spoken to the Cardinal on behalf of the Book of Common Prayer as the kind of formulary on the basis of which he imagined Protestants and Catholics could be brought to reunite,¹ and the Cardinal, anxious to get the English to Trent, may have responded by a proposal that the matter should be laid before the

¹ Cf. Throckmorton to Cecil, December 28, 1561. *C.S.P.* p. 751.

coming session of the Council. As the question of Breviary reform which soon after resulted in the introduction of St. Pius V.'s Breviary, was then to the front, the idea would naturally suggest itself. But there is no reason to suppose that the Pope knew anything at all about the proposal, much less authorized it: and even the Cardinal of Lorraine had presumably not examined the book with care or perhaps even seen it. Nor if he had could any conclusion of importance be deduced. Although a Cardinal, there was in him much more of the politician, than of the theologian. Such, when reduced to its proper dimensions, is the slight historical nucleus out of which was developed the myth of a distinct Papal offer to approve the entire contents of the Book of Common Prayer. We may now return to Mr. Butler.

We cannot deal with every statement in his book, but before passing on to his other witnesses we may remark in a single sentence, that it is another and an oft-refuted misstatement of which he is guilty when he says that no objection was taken by the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities to attendance at the Protestant services till 1570, when the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth stopped it. This excommunication had no bearing whatever upon the subject, and does not refer to it in a single sentence. The more clear-headed Catholics refused from the first to attend Protestant services, whilst those who did attend defended their action on the ground that they only attended as spectators and did not join in the heretical worship.¹ Of course this is said of those

¹ See *Alleged Antiquity of Anglicanism*, pp. 57—61, by the present writer.

Catholics who were endeavouring to be faithful to the ancient religion. There were besides unfortunately large numbers driven by the royal terrors to the sacrifice of their conscientious convictions. But the conduct of such persons cannot possibly be cited as evidence that the Catholic authorities saw no harm in it.

k. Urban VIII. is brought forward as the next witness.

That he not only appreciated the high character of Archbishop Laud, but also admitted the authority of that Anglican prelate to exercise the sacred functions of Episcopacy, is shown by the fact that the Papal offer of a Cardinal's hat was twice made to Laud—once on the very morning his predecessor died, and again on his own accession to the Primacy in 1633. (p. 12.)

Ans. That some person did make Laud an offer of a Cardinal's hat on the two occasions mentioned, and that that person did profess himself able to make good the promise, is clear from the entries in Laud's diaries.¹ But it is a wonderful jump from the fact of this mysterious offer on the part of an unknown person to the conclusion that Urban VIII. sanctioned it. Probably the message came from some member of the household of Queen Henrietta Maria, who was a Catholic. She may have thought she could obtain the hat from Rome. But even if the Queen had such an idea, or the Pope either, it must be shown, and it will be hard to show, that there was no condition attached requiring Laud first to reunite England to the Catholic Church on the basis of complete submission to the Papacy,

¹ For August 4, and August 17, 1633.

and to accept reordination and reconsecration from Catholic prelates.

l. Innocent XI. is the next Pontifical witness. But, as the author truly remarks, the efforts to bring about reunion which this Pontiff is said to have sanctioned, related to German Lutherans, not to Anglicans. In this case it should be clear even to Anglicans that ordination by Catholic Bishops must have been regarded by the Pope as a necessary condition. They ought, therefore, in consistency, to perceive that an invitation to return to the Catholic Church addressed to Anglicans does not necessarily involve recognition of their Orders. We must know the terms on which the return was considered practicable, and whether these did not include receiving fresh Orders.

m. Innocent XII., in 1693,

Solemnly defined that the King, James II., was bound to maintain and defend the succession (of the Non-Juring Anglican Bishops), as long as the laws of the kingdom, under which the Anglican Church was established, were in force. Had His Holiness held the English Episcopate and priesthood to be invalid or sacrilegious, this judgment would of course have been impossible. (p. 14.)

Ans. Innocent XII. solemnly defined nothing. He only replied to an inquiry from James II., then an exile at St. Germain's, that he could lawfully issue a *congé d'élire* to the Non-Juror Bishops to enable them to continue their succession. A *congé d'élire* is a permission, and permission does not necessarily involve full belief in the rectitude of what is permitted. Or, if Mr. Butler thinks otherwise, at all events it would have been on that ground that

Innocent XII. based his answer, and along with him Bossuet and De Harlay, who appear to have previously advised the King in the same sense.¹

These are all the Popes alleged to have recognized Anglican Orders. For if "*Clement XIV.* heartily desired and personally laboured to bring about a union between the two Churches," he only desired what every Pope who has sat in the chair of St. Peter since the Reformation has desired, and according to his opportunities toiled for. We all desire reunion—but reunion without sacrifice of truth: in other words, reunion by way of the return of the schismatic bodies to their obedience to the Holy See. And on this ground we may likewise disregard, without further inquiry into the genuineness of his facts, Mr. Butler's citation of certain other Catholic personages, such as *Cardinals Barberini* and *De Noailles*, *Panzani*, and *Bishop Doyle*, whom he alleges to have desired and laboured for the reunion of the separated bodies with the Catholic Church. All of them may not have been quite orthodox in their conception of what would be required to make "reunion" possible, but they all held the Anglican position to be untenable, and submission to the Holy See to be essential; and none of them has committed himself, as far as we know, to the acceptance of Anglican Orders.

We have next to examine the cases of a few Anglican convert clergymen who, according to Mr. Butler, were allowed by the Catholic authorities to use their Anglican Orders. Of these cases we

¹ See Hutton, p. 138.

must say at the outset, that if the contention concerning them were made good, nothing would be proved except that certain Bishops are chargeable with a grave abuse. The Church's practical rule for her Bishops to follow is clear.

We are careful not to decide of ourselves a question which interests the whole Church, or to separate ourselves from the practice of the Holy See, and nearly all the Bishops and our own hitherto, in ordaining those who, having been ordained by the Anglican rite, ask permission to enter into the communion of the Roman Church thus to exercise the sacred ministry. If there were any question of a change so considerable, if we were under any necessity of pronouncing judgment on so important a subject, we should have recourse to the authority of the Holy See: we should consult the Bishops, our colleagues, &c.

These are the words of *Cardinal de Noailles*¹ (whom nevertheless Mr. Butler has no hesitation to cite as one of his witnesses) in his condemnation of Le Courayer's two books.

But let us hear the cases in which convert Anglican clergymen are alleged to have received ecclesiastical permission to use their Orders in the Catholic Church.

a. Father Serenus Cressy, O.S.B.,² converted in 1646. Mr. Butler quotes from his *Exomologesis* (an autobiographical work) a passage which, as it stands, might seem to imply that he believed in Anglican Orders. It ceases, however, to bear that construction when we discover that the author is describing not his actual views, but only those he had held during an earlier stage of his religious inquiries. Father

¹ Estcourt, App. xxxi.

² P. 27.

Cressy tells us that the progress of the great Rebellion forced him to contemplate the possibility of the Anglican Church ceasing to exist. In that contingency what was he to do? Among the courses open to him one was to become Presbyterian. But this system had not commended itself to him on account of its want of an episcopate. Eventually he was led to think of the Catholic Church, and learning to regard it with other eyes, he came at last to recognize it as the one true Church of God. Later he became a Benedictine and worked as a priest. Anglicans say that he was never reordained: but for this notion there is no other ground than pure conjecture. We may be sure he was reordained like every one else.¹

b. Dr. Stephen Gough,² a clerical convert of the same period. Of him it is alleged that "the Archbishop of Paris, being of the same opinion (viz., that Dr. Gough's previous Orders were valid), allowed him without reordination to exercise the functions of a priest in the archdiocese," and that on the rise of some opposition, repeated examinations by the Doctors of the Sorbonne resulted only in more emphatic approval of the Archbishop's action.

Ans. The authority for all this is that of a certain Obadiah Walker, as reported by the Anglican Dr. Prideaux in his *Validity of the Orders of the Church of England*.³ Against his testimony we have (1) the word of *Father Francis of Sancta Clara* (another of Mr. Butler's witnesses, although Canon Estcourt had previously given a long extract from him in dead

¹ See *Letter to Dr. F. G. Lee*, p. 251. By Dom Raynal.

² P. 28. ³ P. 78, Edit. 1716.

opposition to Anglican Orders).¹ Sancta Clara says that "Gough was reordained as all others have been."² This also is stated by Le Quien,³ an authority who had excellent means of information, and who mentions that the reordination took place in the presence of the celebrated Morinus. Dr. Dodd, the historian, who made his studies at the Sorbonne, further tells us, in his Life of Gough,⁴ that he searched in vain for any evidence of the supposed investigations of that body, and also that he was the possessor of a MS. work in defence of Anglican Orders by Dr. Cosin, who resided at Paris at the very time of Gough's conversion, and yet betrays no consciousness of a transaction which would have been so useful to his argument. We may be sure after all this, that Mr. Obadiah Walker has misled us.

c. Sir Harry Trelawney was a convert who lived well into the earlier half of this century. Unquestionably he believed in his Anglican Orders, and Dr. F. G. Lee⁵ transcribes for us the written testimony concerning him of his son, Colonel Jonathan Trelawney, and of Mr. Ambrose Philipps de Lisle, who had known the father personally. According to these witnesses, Sir Harry Trelawney frequently celebrated Mass on the sole ground of his Anglican Orders, and although he was obliged to leave England on account of Catholic opposition to his practice, he was able to continue it abroad "with the full knowledge and consent, if not with the approbation and license of the French and Italian authorities." At length in

¹ P. 235.

² *Ibid.* p. 236.

³ ii. 316.

⁴ *Church History of England*, vol. iii. p. 306. Folio Edition.

⁵ *Validity of Anglican Orders*, pp. 304, &c.

1830 he fell into the hands of Cardinal Odescalchi who persuaded him to be reordained by himself "with a tacit condition, the sacramental form, of course, remaining untouched." Sir Harry, we are told, consented to this, not for his own sake, but to "remove the scruples of Roman Catholics."

Here we have a very circumstantial account by two upright witnesses, who tell us they received it from Sir Harry Trelawney himself: so that it is his authority on which it all rests. In the absence of any external means of testing it we must apply to the story the test of internal credibility. Nor is it difficult to read through the lines what occurred. That this convert was well-intentioned is quite clear, but it is also clear that he was wrong-headed. It is quite impossible to believe that he received any proper sanction from "the French and Italian authorities," for even if we could allow that his Anglican Orders were valid, he could not have lawfully used them until the suspension had been taken off which he had incurred by receiving them outside the Church. For instance, if an Anglican clergyman, ordained by a Bishop of the Order of Corporate Reunion, were to join the Catholic Church, and it were found on inquiry that his Orders thus received were indisputably valid, he would still be treated as under suspension, and forbidden their exercise until the suspension had been removed by competent authority. And again in such a case as Sir Harry Trelawney's, even if the Orders had been recognized, the suspension incurred by receiving them outside the Church would never have been removed until the omitted ceremonies, unction, tradition of the instru-

ments, &c., had first been supplied. This is our practice even with ordinations received among ourselves, whenever by any accident, as of illness, the ceremony of ordination has been interrupted after the imposition of hands, and before the further ceremonies have been reached. A convert like Sir Harry Trelawney could hardly have received sanction from any well-informed Catholic authorities to disregard a precaution wont to be exacted even in a case of omission among ourselves.

And then there is another important matter of Catholic practice which this story leaves out of account. To be able lawfully to say Mass it is not enough to be validly ordained and free from suspension. Every priest requires leave to celebrate in the diocese in which he is, and a foreign Bishop never gives that leave without the testimony of the priest's own Bishop, which is usually furnished by a *Celebret*. Even then, the priest cannot say Mass in a private oratory without a further special leave; and on presenting himself in a foreign church, he must produce his papers. It would seem that Sir Harry Trelawney said Mass in his own house without due permission; and surely the Catholic Church cannot be held responsible for deeds directly contrary to her laws, any more than she is responsible for the deeds of those Anglican clergymen who succeed in imposing on the ignorance of some continental priest, and causing him to believe that they are Catholic priests in his sense of the word. Cardinal Odescalchi would naturally have desired to deal as gently as possible with this gentleman, and there could be no harm in allowing him to take his fresh ordination as con-

ditional; and it must be remembered that the Sacrament of Orders cannot be validly administered to an unwilling subject, so that a condition supplied by the recipient would have its efficacy. We have, therefore, in this instance nothing more than a very deplorable scandal, resulting more from wrong-headedness than from any evil disposition.

We have now examined all the cases in which the ecclesiastical authorities of the Catholic Church are alleged to have given practical acknowledgment to Anglican Orders, and have found them all wanting. Cases of private belief on the part of a few individual Catholics go for very little. But what is striking about these cases is that they are so few in number, and invariably such persons are found to miss the point of the reasons for which these Orders are rejected by the vast majority. Out of the large number which Mr. Butler claims, there are but one or two cases which he can support with satisfactory evidence. These fall into two classes: a few English Catholics, all but one converts, and a little group of French theologians at the beginning of the last century. The English Catholics are *Father Peter Walsh* in the seventeenth century, *Sir Harry Trelawney*, *Mr. Ambrose P. de Lisle*, and *Mr. H. N. Oxenham* in this (for *Mr. Edmund Ffoulkes* was always much more of an Anglican than a Catholic): possibly also one or two others, though of them there is no proof of any value.

If *Bossuet* was really one of the French group (and it looks as if he were), he is the one good man among them. He too, however, as far as we

have evidence of his reasons, missed the true point of the argument. He seems to have overlooked the important consideration indicated higher up in this tract, the necessity of an orthodox intention where the form has been rendered ambiguous. Nor did he know the further evidence brought to light in modern days which renders the likelihood of Barlow's consecration much less than it could have seemed then.

Apart from Bossuet, the French group was made up of a little party of Gallicans otherwise noted for their heterodox opinions: *Girardin, Du Pin, Le Courayer*, &c. Le Courayer wrote two books in favour of Anglican Orders, which are highly esteemed among Anglicans. But these books are full of unsound doctrine, for which they encountered episcopal and Papal condemnations. In conformity with the principle stated above, the condemnations do not fall on the advocacy of Anglican Orders, but on the false doctrine scattered throughout the books. This, however, reacts on the advocacy of the Orders. What value can be set on a defence of Anglican Orders which is based on a false statement of the Catholic doctrine?

These seem to be about all whom Mr. Butler is entitled to claim as witnesses: for, as has been said, the mass of those whom he cites, he cites without reason. In particular, he has no business to cite the *Comte de Maistre*, and some others, who refer to the *external* hierarchy of Anglicanism as a feature in its favour which may enable it to bridge over the wider gap between the Catholic Church and other sects, and so prepare the way for their return, as well as its own, to Catholic unity. Nor is Mr. Butler entitled

to claim the late *Archbishop Darboy* merely because the Episcopalian Bishop Cleveland Coxe has had the cruelty to misreport the dead man as having said that "he did not believe in anything but the Church of England;"¹ to have said which would have been to confess that he was living the life of a hypocrite and perjurer. Nor must he claim the *Inopportunist Bishops* of the Vatican Council, merely because some unknown (but doubtless Anglican) correspondent of Bishop Wordsworth's conceived the comical idea that they "would be very thankful for the moral support of the Anglican Episcopate."²

If *Bishop Milner* (+1826) could be truthfully cited by Anglicans as having believed in Anglican Orders, his authority would be valuable to them. But what has Mr. Butler done? He has quoted, as giving Milner's own view, a few words from the *Letter to a Prebendary*, in which the writer states what he conceives to be the view of the Anglican Articles. And he passes over in silence the passage in the *End of Controversy*,³ Milner's great work, in which the Bishop says expressly, and gives his reasons for saying, that "the [Anglican] Orders are, to say the least, exceedingly doubtful."

Bishop Baines (+1843) is also wrongfully cited, after Dr. F. G. Lee, as "well known by many who were personally acquainted with him to have held the opinion that Anglican Orders are valid." Since Dr. Lee wrote, Dom Raynal, in his *Letter to Dr. F. G. Lee*, has collected for us the testimony of three intimate friends of Bishop Baines, Mgr. Canon Bonomi, who was his Vicar General, Dr. Neve,

¹ P. 2.² P. 5.³ C. 29.

afterwards Provost of Clifton, and Canon Shattock of the same diocese. All three testify that the Bishop frequently spoke of these Orders, and always as spurious. And, according to Dom Raynal, the Bishop has left a written record that these were his true views, in a lecture given at Bath, in Lent, 1829. Perhaps Mr. Butler will say he never heard of Dom Raynal's pamphlet. It may be so: for we can see from his tract that he has heard of very little which his subject required him to hear of and consult. Nearly all his references are second-hand. But, in any case, he can now learn from Dom Raynal to place less trust in vague, hearsay, evidence.

Bishop Strossmayer, the famous Inopportunist Bishop of the Vatican Council, is credited with a speech attributed to him in *The Pope and the Gospel*. If the speech were genuine, it would follow not only that Bishop Strossmayer believed in Anglicanism, but also that he did not believe in Catholicism. He is credited with saying that

Precedence is one thing—the power of jurisdiction another. For example, supposing that in Florence there was an assembly of all the Bishops of the kingdom, the precedence would be given to the Primate of Florence, as among Easterns it would be accorded to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and in England to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

It ought to be clear to any sensible person that a speech like this could never have been delivered at the Vatican Council, and Cardinal Manning tells us that “when the speech had gone the round of Europe in a polyglot version, Bishop Strossmayer denounced it as a forgery, and his letter has been printed again.

and again in England. Nevertheless, the speech is reprinted continually to this day at Glasgow and Belfast, and sown broadcast by post over these kingdoms."¹

Such a letter of repudiation, written by Bishop Strossmayer to Miss O'Connor Morris, now Mrs. William Bishop, in whose possession it still is, was printed in the *Kent and Sussex Courier* for July 11, 1873, and we have the original before us as we write.

Mademoiselle,

I hasten to reply to your letter received yesterday. The discourse attributed to me is altogether apocryphal. This calumny has been several times reproduced in the German papers. I solemnly contradicted it, and contradict it now, giving you by this letter full power to contradict it everywhere in my name. Receive the assurance of my esteem, with which

I am your servant,

STROSSMAYER, Bishop.

Rohic, July 1, 1873.

Possibly Mr. Butler may say that he was quite unaware of the Bishop's repudiation of the speech. But, in that case, why did he venture to reprint it? In these days we expect of an honourable controversialist that he should not set down facts which raise important issues, without first taking the pains to ascertain if they are accurate. However, as so many of his quotations are like this, second-hand, it is possible he has been the victim of the fraud of others, and that his own offence is the less offence of reckless reliance on dubious second-hand authorities. In that case, he will be only too anxious to with-

¹ *The Story of the Vatican Council*, p. 165.

draw the charges against so many Catholic authorities, which in the face of the evidence we have set before him he cannot fail to see are untrue; and should he do this, we would wish to be among the first to acknowledge that the graver guilt lies at the door of the Anglican authorities on whom he has relied rather than at his.

We might stop here, but perhaps it will help to add a few words in order to define our relation as Catholics to this question of Anglican Orders.

The intervention of Catholic ecclesiastical authority, as distinguished from the intervention of Catholic theological and controversial writers, on the question of Anglican Orders, has hitherto been confined exclusively to the practical order. When a convert Anglican clergyman seeks admission into the ranks of our clergy, the question of his previous Orders is forced upon the attention of the authorities. In considering it they have not been actuated by any extraneous considerations, but purely and simply by their duty as guardians of the sacraments of the Church; a duty which requires them to take extreme care, both lest by reason of invalid Orders in the minister invalid sacraments should be offered to the faithful, and lest, by a ceremony of re-ordination where the previous Orders were valid, a sacrilegious injury should be done to the sacrament. Their decision under this profound sense of responsibility, a decision from which they have never seen reason to depart since it was first arrived at under Mary, has been to treat the previous Anglican Orders as invalid.

The judgment of the writers who have at various

times composed treatises on the subject, theological and controversial, has, and claims to have, only private authority. Still, it is in conformity with the afore-mentioned practice of the Church authorities, and puts forth, to say the least, weighty reasons in its defence. What, in view of it, should be the effect upon the Anglican clergy seems to us to be this. It should, if they believe in the sacramental system, cause them to refrain from using Orders received after the Anglican method: for it is clearly unlawful to use Orders the validity of which is at all doubtful. In the Catholic Church extreme sensitiveness on this point is invariably felt. Whenever, through any accidental departure from the prescribed ritual, a recipient finds himself faced with the possibility, even the bare possibility, that his Orders may not have been adequately given, nothing will induce him to use them until the defect has been remedied. When, among Anglicans, in spite of the suspiciousness of Barlow's episcopal character, of the ambiguity of the Edwardine Ordinal, and the known heretical views of Parker's consecration, not a trace of such sensitiveness is found, does not its absence point to a want of due realization of the importance of the sacramental system? And when this realization is so defective, is it surprising that we should find it hard to agree upon the historical question? The divergence between us is on first principles. Anglicans, even High Church Anglicans, have not yet grasped the Catholic doctrine of Holy Orders.

A LETTER ON

THE REVIVAL OF THE CATHOLIC

FAITH IN ENGLAND.

BY
CHARLES T. GATTY, F.S.A.

THIRD AND REVISED EDITION.

“And the Spirit and the Bride say ‘Come . . . And let him that is athirst come.’”—*Rev. xxii. 17.*



LONDON: CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY.
OFFICE: 18 WEST SQUARE, S.E.
DEPÔTS: 21 WESTMINSTER BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.; 245
BROMPTON ROAD, S.W.; 22 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1894.

Contents.

	PAGE.
Introduction	1
The Marriage Question	3
Vows and Poverty	5
A Fair Conclusion	6
Fasting	7
The Bible	9
The Infallibility of the Pope	12
Outside the Catholic Church	17
The Protestant Bible Theory	20
The Greek Church	22
A Fair Conclusion	22
The One Thing needful	24
The Catholic Religion or nothing	26
Questions	27
History and Antiquity	29
Relics	31
The Crucifix	31
Extreme Unction.. .. .	32
Catholic Worship	32

	PAGE.
Protestant Ritual	35
Protestantism and Art	37
Catholic Music	38
The Communion of Saints	40
The Church Triumphant	44
The Blessed Virgin	44
Confession	46
Be Modest	48
Protestant Moral Theology	49
The Penal Laws	50
Will England become Catholic?	51
Signs of the Times	52
History Re-written	54
The Unprejudiced Public	55
Conclusion	59

A LETTER ON THE
REVIVAL OF THE CATHOLIC
FAITH IN ENGLAND.

Introduction.

1. After being kept down by force for near three hundred years, the Catholic faith is once more taught in this land. Some amongst you, who favour free trade in religious beliefs, and think that every man may save his soul by the light of his own conscience, without hindrance from others, do not object to the Catholic revival. Others protest against it, and call the Catholics idolaters, spies working for a foreign sovereign, inciters to immorality, and clever but dangerous persons. Such are the accusations brought against us Catholics, whose chief fault is our religion.

2. Do you suppose that we can listen patiently to such charges, and say nothing? Those among you who are fair minded (and these increase daily) would like to hear from one of us what we believe in, and why we believe it. You see us walk about in flesh and blood, obey the laws of the land, fill offices of trust, and bring up our children as becomes Christian people. You see that though we be full of human weakness, at any rate we try to live soberly and justly in the sight of God and man.

3. I cannot in this letter explain everything. I can only try to answer some of the common objections against our faith. I was born a Protestant, and brought up in Protestant prejudice, so I have felt what many of

you now feel. God forbid I should blame you for hating what you do not know, and what you are told is vile. I only say that in abusing us you know not what you do. This religion, which you may loathe or despise, is the faith of nearly two hundred millions of Christians. It was the religion of millions upon millions of your forefathers for more than one thousand years. Even now, most of you say "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," although some do not know what they mean by the words, and hardly any two mean the same thing. But think where you would be if there had been no Catholic Church. From her you got the Scriptures, which she kept for you. You yourselves could not know which writings were inspired and which were not, *unless she had already settled that for you*. I cannot praise you for the care you have taken of that Sacred Revelation. Some of your best intellects have torn it to pieces. The critics of Germany have thrown doubt on almost every book. One of your own Bishops, Dr. Colenso, has placed weapons in the hands of the opponents of Revelation. There is no form of belief, however strange, amongst the 228 registered Protestant sects in *Whitaker's Almanack*, which is not defended out of the Bible; and you know well that 228 sects, believing different doctrines, cannot *all* of them be right. Many of you deplore these dreadful results of the unrestrained intellect of man making what it pleases out of the Word of God, and you did not set the ball rolling. You were born into Protestantism, you did not begin it.

4. I want you to be patient and practical. Do not let us argue about what happened in Spain three hundred years ago, when Catholic and Protestant burnt one another as a matter of course, but let us come to business, here in England. Let us see what these priests are who have come to set up again the Old Faith. You have seen them, perhaps, in the street—gentle, quiet men who preach practical sermons, give the Sacraments, pray and study at home, visit the poor, and console the

sick and dying. If you talk to them they will not strike you as dangerous characters. If you visit them after a Protestant lecture, and expect to be given clever hints as to how to cheat your masters, or lead young people into sin, you will be disappointed. But if the world wearies you, and you have forgotten God ; if your heart is bruised, and darkness is around you ; then an hour with one of our clergy will help you towards light and peace.

5. I have had experience of Catholic priests in our large towns, and I can say that they are a most simple, God-fearing, self-sacrificing, and ill-paid body of men. They are in the lowest slums of London, Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester. Nothing is too vile, too poor, or too outcast for them. They live *with* the poor, and *for* the poor. The Irish fever killed thirty priests in Liverpool and Leeds, "young men in the flower of their days, old men who seemed entitled to some quiet time after their long toil," but plenty more volunteered to take their places. Father Damien, who gave his life for the lepers on an island in the Pacific, and whose body was eaten away by that fearful scourge, excited the sympathy of English Protestants, who loaded him with gifts ; but he is only one amongst ten thousand. I leave you to say whether Almighty God gives such graces to idolaters and immoral teachers. By their fruits shall ye know the Catholic clergy.

The Marriage Question.

6. "Yes," I hear you say, "but your priest has *got no wife* ; I consider that a clergyman, like the Apostle Peter, should be married." To which I reply, it is quite true St. Peter was married, but it is also true that it was he who said to Christ, "Behold we have forsaken *all*, and followed Thee." And what did Jesus say to St. Peter ? Did He rebuke him for leaving his home ? Not at all. He answered, "Everyone that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or

WIFE, or children, or lands, for My name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." If you accept the Gospel, you cannot abuse the Catholic clergy for leaving all domestic ties for the sake of Christ, because our Lord praised those who left their wives. He promised them rewards in eternal life. He praised those who kept from marriage for His sake. His Apostle John saw them in heaven, and speaks of them as "the hundred and forty and four thousand which were redeemed from the earth. These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth." St. Paul teaches that the unmarried can serve God with greater effect than the married. He writes:—"He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife."

7. With Christ, with St. Paul, and with the Catholic Church, marriage is elevated into a Sacrament; but the Catholic Church, like our Lord, takes her Apostles from those who have the higher *call* to an unmarried life. Marriage is a natural vocation, celibacy a supernatural. The natural man prefers marriage. The domestic virtues of the English Protestant clergy are well known. The easy income, the quiet vicarage, the well-ordered family, the pony-carriage, and the position in county society, are things to which the natural man looks forward as temporal blessings. But the vocation of the Catholic priest is one that is hungered after only by the supernatural man. It is a call *out of*, and not *into*, the world. The world laughs at the consecration of a pure life to the service of God, as much now as when the early Christian writer Athenagoras said to the Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius, "You will find many of our people, both men and women, grown old in the single state, in hope thereby of a closer union with God." The world was wrong then, and the world is wrong now.

Protestantism is on the same side with the world; the Catholic Church is of one mind with the early Christian writer.

Vows and Poverty.

8. "That may be," you say, "but your clergy take vows of poverty as well as chastity. What *is* the use of that? I do not approve of taking vows at all." To which I answer, be patient, and look again at Scripture, and see if you have not missed as much about this as about marriage.

9. Does not the Christian life begin with vows made at Baptism? The practice of binding the soul to God by a vow was a Jewish custom, continued by the Christians. In the book of Numbers we learn that "Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord." In Deuteronomy we read, "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not be slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee." In the Acts of the Apostles not only did St. Paul take a vow, but he shaved his head as an outward sign of the fact. The Catholic clergy, like St. Paul, shave a tonsure on the head when they take priestly vows.

10. You may think it "rubbish," but do you think the practice was "rubbish" in St. Paul? Ladies mark their marriage vows with a ring; teetotalers show a blue riband, and Freemasons and Oddfellows wear badges and decorations as symbols of their profession. You do not jeer at these nor say it is "rubbish;" but when some poor Catholic priest marks his profession by an outward sign of the inward grace, then it is "rubbish," and "mummery," and "superstition." Holy Scripture and the practice of St. Paul is with the Catholic priest; Protestantism is against him.

11. Then as to Poverty. Is it not a sacrifice, pleasing to God? "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," says St. Paul, "that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor." "Woe unto you that

are rich," says our Lord. A camel may more easily go through the eye of a needle than a rich man enter the Kingdom of God. Christianity began among the poor. The Redeemer had no place to lay His head. He was born in a stable, and died without possessions upon a cross. When the rich young man asked what good thing he should do to gain eternal life, Jesus said "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." The youth replied, "All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?" Jesus answered, "*If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow Me.*" Here you see that the call to apostleship is a *step beyond* the keeping of the commandments. All who would "enter into life" must do that, but of others more is expected.

12. God often calls baptized Christians, Catholic or Protestant, to give up all and follow Christ. I have seen such calls in Protestant families. A son or daughter has quoted the words of our Lord to a parent, and what has been the result? In nine cases out of ten a very serious *row*! The sentiment has been snubbed, and the child disgraced or turned away from home. You can see why; Protestantism does not like such calls, and does not know what to do with them. As Lord Macaulay said, "The ignorant enthusiast whom the Anglican Church makes an enemy—and, whatever the polite and learned may think, a most dangerous enemy—the Catholic Church makes a champion."*

A Fair Conclusion.

13. And now, reader, do you not see that Catholics have kept up high ideals of chastity, poverty, and leaving ties for the sake of Christ, which Protestants have quite passed over? These ideals are part of Christ's teaching; they are often praised and blessed in the Gospel, yet where shall we find them even encouraged in any

* Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes.

Protestant sect? If you believe the words of Christ, you *must* believe in the virtue of giving up home and friends and wife and family for His sake. You cannot take *what you like* out of Christ's teaching, and *leave the rest*. You cannot pick and choose only what suits *your own private feelings*. Some of you may have felt this call. How dreadful that you should never have been able to answer it! "Go and sell all that thou hast, and follow Me"—have you never wondered why Protestants ignored these words? Catholics have never ignored them. There have always been Catholic monks and nuns on the earth, giving up all for Christ, and leading lives apart from the world. This is our strong point to-day, as it was our strong point a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago. God calls us now—one from this trade, another from that—to give up all for Him. We can go; there is no "row" at home. Parents weep at the parting—Catholic sisters and brothers love each other as tenderly as any others—but when the call comes, all thank God for His mercy in giving their family such a mark of His love. The Catholic mother is as *proud* that Christ has called her son, as that mother who prayed the Lord that her boys might sit beside Him in heaven.

Fasting.

14. There is another peculiarity about Catholics. They live a life of *fasting*, as well as of prayer. "Well," I hear some Protestant exclaim, "surely you must admit that *that* is nonsense." I am not going to admit that *anything* is nonsense about religious matters because you say so. I know that Protestants often think things "nonsense" which are part of Christ's teaching.

15. Was it "nonsense" in St. John Baptist to eat only locusts and wild honey, and wear a camel's-hair garment with leathern girdle? If so, I will admit that our monks are guilty of equal folly, for they have the spare diet, the rough clothing, and the leathern girdle. But look to the Example of examples, Christ Himself.

Did He fast; or did He not? Did He commend the practice, or was He indifferent to it? Our Lord fasted forty days and forty nights. He is our model in fasting as well as in prayer. After He had ordained a form of prayer, He *immediately* went on to give orders as to fasting. The disciples of John asked why Christ's disciples did not fast, and He replied that the children would not mourn as long as the bridegroom was with them, "but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, *and then shall they fast.*" And they did fast when He was gone. St. Paul writes, "In all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions . . . in *fastings.*" In another passage he speaks of his own "*fastings often.*" When St. Paul and St. Barnabas were called to the ministry by the Holy Ghost, the prophets and teachers at Antioch "ministered to the Lord, and *fasted,*" and those who were to be ordained "*fasted* and prayed" also.

16. Perhaps you will say that fasting is a Protestant virtue. I hope it is. If so, it is certainly done secretly. I spent all my young life in a Protestant clergyman's family, and always lived amongst Protestant friends, and save in a very few cases I never heard of fasting as a Protestant practice. It formed no part of the Protestant sermons I heard for years. Of all Catholic practices it is the one most open to notice and ridicule, because it comes under observation at hospitable Protestant tables. The Catholic Church is practical, and there are fixed times for fasting. We have our rules, and though you may say they are silly, we find them edifying. When there are no regulations, pious practices are apt to fall into disuse.

17. So you see fasting is another of the cases which prove that Catholics not only *hear* the Word of God, but *keep it*. And, if medical men are right, there never was an age when abstinence was more needed. Food is cheap and abundant, and the London physicians are always preaching a prudent abstinence to those who make their belly their god. Gluttony is a sin, but it is

one seldom spoken of. Mr. Ruskin says that the English clergy *dare* not tell the truth to their congregations now-a-days. If this is because they live too much on a level with their flocks, and try for nothing higher, then perhaps the world is finding out that our monks are right after all.

The Bible.

18. You may say it is no good defending Catholics out of the Bible, because we do not believe in the Bible. Nay more, that we suppress the Bible, and forbid our people to read it. Of course if you knew more about the Catholic Church than I, who have been studying it from the inside for several years, I would listen to such a statement; but the fact of anyone thinking it true, proves that they know nothing whatever about the Church. My Catholic Bible is before me. It is the English translation of the New Testament first printed in 1582, and the same of the Old Testament first printed in 1600. It is the translation ordered by the Pope and Bishops, which has been regularly printed for the last three hundred years. How do I come by such a thing if it is forbidden? Some Bibles *have* been forbidden, I know, but those were prejudiced translations.

19. It is not true that Luther *re-discovered* the Bible after it had been lost for ages. This is a lie, and I will prove it. In 1877 the Caxton Exhibition took place in London, to which were sent many examples of early printing, and several editions of the Bible, printed in all the European languages *before Luther was born*. The *Athenæum*, the leading Protestant literary newspaper in England, says, "It is time we should hear no more of Luther as the first German Bible translator." I should think so. Why, *there were twenty-seven different editions of the Bible in German printed before Luther's*. Another Protestant journal, writing on the Caxton Exhibition, says:—

"This catalogue will be very useful for one thing at any rate as

disproving *the popular lie* about Luther *finding* the Bible for the first time at Erfurt about 1507. Not only are there very many editions of the Latin Vulgate long anterior to that time, but there were actually NINE GERMAN EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE IN THE CAXTON EXHIBITION EARLIER THAN 1483, THE YEAR OF LUTHER'S BIRTH, and at least three more before the end of the century."

20. Three Italian editions of the Bible were printed in the year 1471, *twelve years before Luther was born!* "More than forty editions of the Bible in Italian," says Mr. Allnatt, "are reckoned before the appearance of the first Protestant edition!" The Bible was translated into Spanish in 1405, and was printed in 1478, before Luther was in existence. In France the publication took place in the same year.

As soon as the art of printing was known, the Catholic Church published the Scriptures, as she had multiplied them in manuscript. The Protestant Canon Dixon says:—"From the earliest times the English Church or nation was possessed of the sacred writings through the labours of monks or bishops."

He also explains why the English Catholic bishops burnt some editions of the Bible. He says:—

"If the clergy had acted thus simply because they would have kept the people ignorant of the word of God, they would have been without excuse. BUT IT WAS NOT SO. Every one of the little volumes containing portions of the sacred text that was issued by Tyndale, contained also a prologue and notes written with such hot fury of vituperation against the prelates and clergy, the monks and friars, the rites and ceremonies of the Church, as . . . was hardly likely to commend it to the favour of those who were attacked. Moreover, the versions themselves were held to be hostile to the Catholic faith, as it was then understood *and to convey the sense unskilfully or maliciously.*"

It is against *prejudiced translations*, against *Protestant notes and interpretations*, and against *mistranslations*, and not against the Holy Scripture itself, that Catholic authorities have proceeded.

21. Remember this, too: Protestants cannot wipe off the Statute Book of England the following enact-

ment passed years after the Reformation by a Protestant Parliament:—

“That a penalty of a month’s imprisonment should be inflicted for each offence upon any woman, husbandman, artificer, serving-man, apprentice, or journeyman, who should read the scripture to themselves, or to others, privately or openly.”

22. Another Protestant, the Rev. E. Cutts, D.D., writes:—

“There is a good deal of popular misapprehension about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the clergy; whereas the fact is that the sermons of the mediæval preachers are more full of Scripture quotations and allusions than any sermons in these days; and the writers on other subjects are so full of scriptural allusion, that it is evident their minds were saturated with scriptural diction Another common ERROR is, that the clergy were unwilling that the laity should read the Bible for themselves, and carefully kept it in an unknown tongue, that the people might not be able to read it. The truth is, that most people who could read at all could read Latin, and would certainly prefer to read the authorized Vulgate to any vernacular version. But it is also true that translations into the vernacular were made We have the authority of Sir Thomas More for saying that ‘the whole Bible was long before Wycliffe’s days, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue, and by goodly and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read.’”

The Protestant *Quarterly Review*, in 1879, said:—

“The notion that people in the Middle Ages did not read their Bibles is probably exploded, except among the more ignorant of controversialists.”

23. And now, reader, be fair towards Catholics over this matter in future. Remember, that God requires of you an account of every judgment you pass on Catholics. Speak against the Church if you like, but *be sure you speak the strict truth about her teaching respecting the Bible*. Be sure you give the words from her Catechism: *—

“Every sort of doctrine which is to be delivered to the faithful is contained in the Word of God, which is divided into Scripture and Tradition.”

* Catechism of the Council of Trent; preface.

Be sure and make it plain that by Tradition she means her own unbroken chain of testimony, to which she appeals for proof when she gives to her children the Books of Holy Scripture themselves. It is from Catholic Tradition alone that we know these books are what we believe them to be. To her Tradition and testimony we look, since it is she that has decided which books are Scripture and which are not.

24. Also, be modest when you think of what has happened to the Bible since it has been consigned to the tender mercies of the Protestant theologians of Germany. Read these few words from the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1880:—

“The land which was the cradle of the Reformation has become the grave of the Reformed faith Denial of every tenet of the Protestant faith among the thinking classes, and indifference in the masses, are the positive and negative agencies beneath which the Church of Luther and Melancthon has succumbed In contiguous parishes of Catholic and Protestant populations, one invariable distinction has long been patent to all eyes and conclusions. *The path to the Catholic Church is trodden bare, that to the Protestant Church is rank with grasses and weeds to the very door.*”

The Infallibility of the Pope.

25. Perhaps you think it is impossible to believe in the infallibility of any human creature. I ask you, why is this impossible? You answer, because all men *can* err and *do* err. I reply if all men *can* err and *do* err, why should not the men who wrote the Holy Scriptures have erred also? You may say *you believe* that Almighty God protected them from error. Exactly, and that is the kind of claim we make for the Pope. We believe that the Pope has divine assistance which enables him to determine matters of faith and morals. You may think it ridiculous, but it may be true for all that. It is not more ridiculous that God should protect the Pope from error in faith and morals, than that God should so protect St. Paul. The subject is a *man* in either case, and though every man be liable

to error, it is not ridiculous to suppose that for a special purpose God might give to any man this divine assistance, as He gave the gifts of prophecy and inspiration to the men of old.

26. Remember, no Catholic believes that the Pope cannot sin. No Catholic believes that the Pope is infallible in *private life*. It is only when, as Supreme Pastor and Teacher of the Church, speaking to the *whole* Church, deciding questions of faith or morals, that we believe him divinely protected from error. The Pope as temporal sovereign has ruled over the States of the Church, but his infallibility "does not touch his decisions in temporal affairs." No Catholic holds that in every speech, conversation, or writing the Pope is infallible.

27. After all, Protestants are in the same boat with Catholics over this. I once asked a Nonconformist Minister, "How is a man to find the truth amidst the present confusion of tongues?" He replied, "If a man takes the Scriptures and seeks the aid of the Holy Spirit, he will be directed into all truth." What is this but saying that every searcher after the light is infallible? Here is not one Pope, but millions. Here is infallibility all round! The only difficulty about the personal infallibility of everybody is, that hardly any two agree about anything, so that thousands of contrary opinions *would all be infallibly true*, and the Holy Spirit would be teaching one thing to one man and an opposite thing to another! Some people find it hard to believe consistent dogmas, but what would they say if they had to believe *inconsistent* ones? If you come to reckon up what is *reasonable* in such a matter as this, surely a system professing one faith, even though it does include the divine assistance of one man when disputes arise as to what is the one truth, is far more logical, and *possible*, than a battle-field of conflicting opinions WHERE EVERYBODY CLAIMS TO BE RIGHT AND NO TWO PEOPLE AGREE.

28. You will tell me that there is not a word in Holy Scripture about the Infallibility of the Pope. I used to think so at one time, but the Bible is a large book, and

the Protestant often picks out what suits his arguments and ignores what supports the Catholic arguments. Let me call your attention to one or two points. Did it ever occur to you to consider the peculiar position given by our Lord to St. Peter?

(1) When our Lord received from His Apostles their declaration of faith in Him as the Son of God, it is Simon Peter who says "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Our Lord even changed Peter's name from Simon to Peter, which means a *Rock*, and said to him:—

"And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

These words have only one meaning. Christ built His Church upon St. Peter, and gave to him the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Explain the words otherwise, and you explain them away. You may say that St. Peter received no more than the rest of the Apostles, or any other Christian—yes, *you may say so*, but Christ says something else.

Our Lord said that St. Peter's confession of faith was no inspiration of flesh and blood, but of "the Father which is in heaven." To St. Peter Christ gave the keys of His Divine Kingdom or Church, for St. Peter was to be the chief steward.

(2) After His Resurrection our Lord called upon St. Peter three times to declare his love, and each time commanded him to feed the sheep and lambs. There was to be the ONE FOLD, and St. Peter was to be the chief shepherd on earth. Even when Jesus foretold that St. Peter would for the moment deny his Master, He assured him that He had specially prayed for him to the Father, and called upon him to confirm his brethren.

(3) In the lists of the Apostles given in the Gospels, St. Peter is always named *first*.

(4) In the Council at Jerusalem, when the Apostles chose one to fill the place of Judas, it is Peter who opens the proceedings and gives directions for the undertaking.

29. The special prerogatives given by Jesus Christ to St. Peter are claimed to-day by his successors, the Popes of Rome. The word *Pope* means *Father*, and the Pope has *always* been regarded as the Father of the faithful in the Catholic Church.

This has been acknowledged by all the early Christian writers. Take these only:—

Tertullian (A.D. 195):—

“Was anything hidden from Peter, who is called the Rock whereon the Church was to be built?”

Origen (A.D. 216):—

“To Peter was the supreme power to feed the sheep delivered, and upon him, as on the earth, the Church was founded.”

“Peter, upon whom the Church of Christ is built.”

St. Cyprian (A.D. 248):—

“Peter, whom the Lord chose as first, and upon whom He built His Church.”

“There is one Church, founded by the Lord Christ upon Peter, for the origin and purpose of unity.”

St. Optatus (A.D. 370):—

“Thou canst not deny that thou knowest that in the city of Rome to Peter first the episcopal chair was given, in which sat the first of all the Apostles, Peter; . . . in which one chair *unity might be preserved by all.*”

St. Ambrose (A.D. 385):—

“Peter’s ship, which is the Church. That ship is not tossed about in which prudence sails, where unbelief is not, where faith blows. . . . For how could that be tossed about in which he presided, *in whom is the foundation of the Church?*”

St. Chrysostom (A.D. 387):—

“Peter, the Head of the Apostles, the first in the Church . . . and when I name Peter I name that unbroken Rock, the firm Foundation.”

St. Augustine (A.D. 430):—

“The Roman Church, in which the supremacy of the Apostolic See has always been in force.”

I could fill a book with like quotations. You may say you do not care what the early Christians believed, but mark this: there are the words of Christ to Peter; you cannot get away from them, and the early Christian interpretation of them is more likely to be Apostolic than yours.

30. “This is all very well,” I hear you say, “but look at your bad Popes!” We do look at them, and we detest the sins of Catholics far more than those of Protestants. But as nobody ever said that Catholics were without offences, it is a poor argument to prove that they are sinners. Suppose St. Paul had sinned after his conversion, would that prove he did not teach true doctrine? You twit us about bad Popes, but what do you think the Apostles would have said if you had twitted them about the apostasy of Judas? There was a man chosen by Christ Himself, and he sells our Lord for thirty pieces of silver! The grace of God is the heavenly treasure, and the heart of man is the earthen vessel. Judas fell away, as many more have done, but God has never left His Church.

31. That Church has existed for more than eighteen hundred years. She has confronted atheism and heresy, has fostered education, and given to the world the highest human achievements in literature and art. She is an independent religious body that stands before kings and claims freedom of conscience for her children. What wonder if from the story of all these centuries the Protestant can unearth sinful acts and errors of judgment, on all matters outside of the realm of faith? What is the testimony of impartial Protestant writers as to the value of the Catholic Church in human history? Mr. Kinglake, in his *Eothen*, remarks:—

“The universal aptness of a religious system for all stages of civilization, and for all sorts and conditions of men, well befits its claim of Divine origin. She is of all nations and of all times, that wonderful Church of Rome.”

The Protestant Dean Milman, speaking of the 5th century, wrote :—

“On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater Sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and, if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be inclined rigidly to question pretensions supported as well by such singular and unimpeachable virtue.”

Again :—

“From the 6th century to the 14th, the Papal power was the great conservator of Christianity, of the best Christianity, perhaps, which those ages could receive, and it was of inestimable benefit to European civilization.”

James Anthony Froude says :—

“Never in all their history, in ancient times or modern, never that we know of, have mankind thrown out of themselves anything so grand, so useful, so beautiful as the Catholic Church once was.”

Archdeacon Farrar says :—

“From the fifth to the thirteenth century, the Church was engaged in elaborating the most splendid organization which the world has ever seen.”

Outside the Catholic Church.

32. The foundation of the Catholic faith is the Word of God interpreted by the Church of Christ. The Holy Spirit was given to the Church to enable her to guide men into all truth. Our Saviour told His Apostles there were things which they could not then “bear” to be taught, but the Spirit of Truth would reveal them. No other body dares to claim this divine assistance except the Catholic Church, and she has enjoyed it from the first. Look at the state of things outside this One Fold! What have men to fall back upon except human judgment when they leave the Church?

33. Consider why you accept Christianity at all. You believe this doctrine, and reject that, but on what system do you do this? You answer that you accept what you find in the Bible, and reject what you do not find there. Which means this—that you make yourself the judge as

to what the Bible says. You allow the same privilege to everybody else until you come to the Catholic, and when he tells you that he finds his religion in the Bible, you denounce him! Surely this is ridiculous. Are not Catholics just as learned, just as sensible as Protestants? Why should not they be just as good interpreters of Scripture? Protestants talk about "liberty of conscience," and "every man saving his own soul by the light given to him." Well, have we not just as good a right to our light as you have to yours? If you say that God enlightens every man who seeks the truth, you cannot deny me that privilege. In denouncing the light I have, you denounce the God Who gave it. You claim liberty for your own conscience, but you deny it to mine. You *profess* one thing, and you *practise* another. You do not really hold that each man may interpret Scripture according to the light he has; you want every man to interpret it according to YOUR way of thinking, and if he does not, you denounce him.

Protestant liberty is a fraud. There was a like liberty among the Kilkenny cats—for the survivors.

34. If Protestants were of one mind as to the meaning of the Bible, their constant appeals to it would be reasonable, but as a matter of fact, no two of them agree as to what it means, whereas Catholics have but one interpretation. The Protestants and their Bible are like relations fighting over a will. One says the departed meant *this*: another says he meant *that*. Each reads the document a different way, to suit his own interest, and the intentions of the writer have to be settled in a court of justice. It is much the same thing with the Testament of our Lord. There is the document; some say it means one thing, some another. It certainly cannot mean fifty things.

You know how the system works. William, Thomas, and James each take a Bible; each finds a religion of his own; each opens a chapel, and starts a sect. One prescribes infant baptism, another adult only. Which is right? You may say that *that* doctrine is unimportant. Is it really *unimportant* whether an infant be baptized or

not? One says our Lord is God, another that He is only a man. Both appeal to the Bible for proof. Which is right? The Church of England declares that two visible sacraments are *necessary to salvation*. The Quakers admit no sacraments at all. Both appeal to the Bible. Which is right? Luther, and after him the Lutheran body to this day, believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament. The Augsburg Confession says:—

“Touching the Lord’s Supper, it is thought, that the true body and blood of Christ are, under the form of bread and wine, truly present, given, distributed, and taken in the Eucharist.”

To put this beyond doubt, the orthodox Lutherans decreed in the “Formulary of Concord,” that the body of Christ is administered *in, with, and under* the bread. In fierce opposition to this most Protestants entirely reject such a doctrine. All appeal to the Bible. Which is right? Here are views wholly opposed to one another, and each exponent appeals to Holy Scripture. In short, may we not say this, that THERE IS NO DOCTRINE WHICH THE WIT OF MAN HATH EVER FASHIONED OUT OF THE WORD OF GOD, THAT HATH NOT BEEN BOTH DEMONSTRATED AND DENOUNCED BY AN APPEAL TO HOLY SCRIPTURE?

35. A Protestant clergyman once tried to find what doctrines are held by all Protestants. He began by stripping off those which are *not* held by every sect, so as to arrive at the residuum which all admit. He wrote:—

“Are Presbyterians Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in Episcopacy. Are Independents Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in any established line of ministry. Are Anabaptists Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in Infant Baptism. Are Quakers Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in any Sacraments. Are the Swiss Calvinists Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in the Atonement. Are the new school of German Lutherans Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in Original Sin. Are Socinians Protestants?—Yes.—Then Protestants, as such, do not believe in our Lord’s Divinity.

"We have now seen that, of all the articles of the Apostles' Creed, Protestants are only agreed in believing two, namely, the first, that there is one God; and the last, the Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting. Nay, I might without any injustice go further. Socinians cannot be said really to hold the first article, because if they deny God the Son, they clearly deny God the Father as Father: and Universalists do not hold the last clause because they deny the eternity of punishment, which is implied in it. The Resurrection of the Body, then, is all that Protestants, as Protestants, of all sects and sorts, agree in believing, I mean of matters contained in the Apostles' Creed, and in the sense of that Creed."

The Protestant Bible Theory.

36. This is built upon *human learning and human opinion*. Our Lord said, "Ye search the Scriptures," but He used those words to the Jews, who were always reading the Old Testament, *and yet were unable to arrive at the truth!* The New Testament was not then written. To search into writings involves the necessity of being able to read. Millions have lived who could not read; how about them? It is no sin to be uneducated. Our Lord never condemned want of scholarship. Before the invention of printing, books had to be written, and were very expensive; one cannot suppose that revelation was dependent on the introduction of a cheap printing press! Our Lord never mentioned the writing of the Gospel; He spoke of it being "preached." He said "He that heareth you heareth Me," but not a word about writing or printing. Supposing, however, we had to search out the truth, how about the average span of man's existence? Who can guarantee life enough to unravel half the difficulties presented by the language only of Holy Scripture? The text is often the translation of a translation: ought we not to assure ourselves of the perfection of these processes? According to modern German and English criticism, the Bible is full of errors and interpolations. Luther called the Epistle of St. James an "epistle of straw," and "was wont to say of the first three Gospels, that in them the Gospel was

not to be found" (Moehler). Dr. Keim rejects the fourth Gospel, and is followed by a host more. If you and I are responsible for searching out revelation, it would be some comfort,—would it not?—to be able to depend on the Bible critics, but I'm afraid that the more they search the more they reject. Is our scholarship sufficient to trace all these arguments? Besides which, what are we to be going on with until we have searched the Scriptures? You may say that you take the Scriptures as you find them. Exactly; your *searching* begins by accepting the testimony of scholars that these books are what you think them to be, and what are you to do now that another group of scholars gives another testimony? *You are at the mercy of human learning.*

37. Again, what will you say to a case like Miss Martineau's? She was one of the ablest of modern Englishwomen. She was honest, and read her Bible, but she came to the terrible conclusion that it was so utterly repugnant to her moral sense, it could not be the Word of God. What could you have said to her? In scholarship she was better than most, in ability she was far above the average, and no doubt she thought her moral sense as correct as yours. You see that if we lean on this person or that, we trust a broken reed. *We are at the mercy of human opinion.*

38. In the Catholic Church you have the *institution*, founded by Christ, years before the Gospels or Epistles were written, against which Christ said the gates of hell should not prevail. You have the command of Christ to "hear the Church," and there is only one institution which claims to be that Church. This Church keeps and interprets the Word of God, because Christ promised its first teachers, "The Spirit shall guide you into all truth." You have also the experience of eighteen centuries. *Inside* the Church the Holy Scriptures and the doctrines of Christ have been *preserved*; whereas outside the Church, both the revelation itself and the doctrines it teaches, change and decay under our very eyes.

The Greek Church.

39. Some Anglicans have a vague hope that though Western Protestantism is getting weaker in its controversy with Rome, still "there is the great Eastern Church." Indeed there is; and Dr. Neale, who knew more about it than any other man in England, tells us that in 1672 that body "*anathematized Protestantism*" at the Council of Bethlehem!

A Fair Conclusion.

40. Now, surely you and I learn from all this that the truth cannot be found amidst such a Babel of testimonies as to what is true and what is not, what is in the Bible, and what is not there. The sects rise and fall. Popular preachers come and go. Doctrines thought very important in one age are lost sight of in the next. Justification by faith is stretched to snapping point, and then scarcely heard of afterwards. The sensible conversions of one generation nearly die out in the next. Among the Nonconformists, pitched battles are going on between Dogmatic Teaching and Free Thought. In some bodies the disintegration goes on so rapidly that brethren dwelling together in unity one day are consigning each other to perdition the next. All the great Protestant teachers have gone on changing their opinions. German Protestantism commenced with a series of splits. A Protestant clergyman writes of this period:—

"In the sixteenth century, those who had separated themselves from the Church of Rome were divided into two great parties—the one called Protestants, that is, the followers of Luther—the other called Reformed, that is, the followers of Calvin. And these two would have no more communion with each other than either would with the Pope. And the railing they used against each other was perfectly frightful. Luther's gentlest terms for Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, are—'dog,' 'beast,' 'hog,' 'antichrist,' 'devil.' When Luther had ended a long and useless conference with Carolstadt, the German leader of the reformed doctrines, they bade adieu to each other thus: 'I trust,' said Carolstadt, 'that I shall live to see you broken on the wheel.' 'And I hope,' returned Luther, 'that I shall hear of your breaking your neck before you reach home.'"

41. All impartial writers agree that these are the broad features of Protestantism. And does not the practical working of the system tell the same tale? Go to an intelligent outsider, an educated Indian or Chinese, and ask him to become a Christian. He at once demands "What am I to believe in?" You reply, "You must believe in God." He says "I believe in several already; what have you got to tell me about *your* God?" You have then to teach the nature of God and the scheme of Christ's Redemption. You have got to say whether Christ is God *or not*. You have got to teach the efficacy of Sacraments *or not*. You have got to say whether we are justified by faith or works, or both. You have got, in short, to put forward the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, or the shorter Catechism of Scotland, or the teachings of Mr. Wesley, or the decisions of the Wesleyan Conference, or the Congregational Union, or the Baptist Union. Intelligent men want an intelligible form of religion. But what will the intelligent stranger say if you give him no description of what he is to believe, or, if you tell him that he must take the Bible and make it out for himself? He will tell you, what most educated Orientals have told you already, that after two hundred years' experience of your teachings they prefer to remain as they are. *If they see that you have not yet agreed amongst yourselves as to what is the truth, they are not likely to adopt your evidently imperfect plan for arriving at it.* I have said that an intelligent man wants an intelligible form of religion, and I may add that a good man wants a practical form. What are we to *do* to inherit eternal life? Are we to go round the town, and take in turn the varied advice of the ministers of all denominations? If *all* are good, why should we miss any? If they are conflicting, on what system shall we accept or reject? "You must baptize unconscious infants," says one; "You must do nothing of the sort," says another; "You must be sensibly converted," says a third; "That is quite unnecessary," adds a fourth; "You must be taught the Church Catechism," says the Churchman; "It is full of Popery,"

says the Nonconformist. Now what is a poor man to do? It is plain that unless he shuts up his mind and works only on his feelings and old associations, and goes where his family goes, he is in a poor case. Faith is *belief* not *speculation*. A life spent in tossing to and fro, from Church to Chapel, from High to Low, from one thing to another, may be speculation but it is not a life of faith.

The One Thing Needful.

42. God has given a message to man, and if you have not got that message, you can neither know God, nor love Him, nor serve Him as you ought. There are many things you need not know. You need not know how far the sun is from the earth, or how the tides rise and fall, but you must know God's message of salvation, for on that hangs your eternal happiness. If you are wrong all your life through your own fault, you are wrong for ever. To reject the truth when it is shown to you, is to give the lie to the Holy Ghost. Reason tells you there can only be ONE revealed truth from God, yet the Protestants teach hundreds of different doctrines! THERE CAN ONLY BE ONE TRUTH ABOUT ANYTHING; THEREFORE, CONFLICTING DOCTRINES CANNOT BE TRUE. Protestantism is a jumble of contradictory doctrines, THEREFORE PROTESTANTISM MUST BE FALSE. A single doctrine may be true, but a bundle of conflicting ones cannot be. The man who says that the sects which teach different doctrines have all got the truth, gives his reason the lie direct.

43. When you come to die and see God face to face, and justify your choice of a religion, how will you explain having mistaken a jumble of contradictions for the ONE TRUTH? Suppose you are a member of the Established Church, can you raise your eyes to the searching light of heaven, and say that the High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church teach one and the same religion? Suppose you die to-night, will you try and deceive God, and tell Him you thought that all these varieties were His

ONE TRUTH? Will you dare to say that you thought a religion true, which had a woman for its Supreme Head who presides over a double-barrelled establishment, teaching Episcopacy in England and Presbyterianism in Scotland?

44. It is all very well now when the world backs you up, but when you die, you die *alone*. *Alone* you go before His awful eyes, from Whom no secrets are hid. Then will arise to condemn you all the excuses you have made for not believing the ONE TRUTH. Your wish to be popular with the world, your wish not to offend your family, your wish to have an easy-going religion—these will all rise and condemn you. You cannot plead that you do not like this Catholic practice, or believe that Catholic doctrine. WHO ARE YOU THAT YOU SHOULD JUDGE GOD'S TRUTH? As long as you live in English Protestant Society you can console yourself with the beautiful Cathedrals, the imposing Bishops, the educated clergy, the eloquence of Canon this, and the moderation of Archdeacon that. But once enter eternity, once let in the rays of everlasting light, and you will see clearly what you now know in part, *that Bishops and clergy who teach opposing doctrines do not and cannot teach the ONE TRUTH sent by God to man.*

St. Paul says "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye ALL SPEAK THE SAME THING." Now you know as well as I do that the Protestant clergy *all speak different things*. People who teach different doctrines belong to different religions, so that to say they all believe the *one truth*, is not only silly, but dishonest.

45. Let us suppose you are a High Churchman, and love Catholic doctrine and ceremonial. You go to St. Alban's, or St. Cuthbert's, where they teach the Real Presence and voluntary Confession. You will tell Almighty God that this was *your* idea of Catholicism according to the latest antiquarian researches. Yes—but stay a moment. Across the street is another Anglican Church, which *you do not attend*, where a Calvinistic

clergyman preaches the Real Absence, and denounces Confession. Will you tell God that you thought the institution which authorized both these parsons to teach, held THE ONE TRUTH? By belonging to the Protestant Establishment you take a share in the blasphemies uttered against our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament all the year round. By sticking to this jumble of contradictions you keep back from the Catholic faith that mass of England's poor who will never believe that the Establishment is Catholic, and who are fast losing all doctrinal belief.

46. That God's one Faith is a subject of dispute is proved by the existence of 228 sects in England teaching 228 versions of Christianity. These are the vulgar fractions of Protestantism, the addition and multiplication of division and subtraction. The proof that these must be wrong is found in the fact that *they do not agree*. Let me put it thus. Without faith it is impossible to please God, and in order to exercise the virtue of faith we must have an object to believe in, and THAT OBJECT MUST BE THE TRUTH. It cannot please God to see us believe in error. If faith is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things unseen, we must know most certainly what these "things" are. We cannot hope for vague "things," nor have evidence of uncertain "things." Without definite doctrine there can be no definite faith. We cannot have faith in a *guess*, or an *opinion* or a *preference*, or in *somebody else's idea*, because these vary and change. Some people believe in the faith of their parents, but Dr. Arnold is said to have remarked that the man who was of the religion of his father *because it was the religion of his father*, was a *fool*.

The Catholic Religion or Nothing.

47. What is the Protestant Establishment but an Act of Parliament compromise between Catholicism and Calvinism? Its bishops and clergy look very nice in the buildings and endowments stolen from the Catholics,

and the world likes them, for they are moderate and easy-going. Then there are the Dissenters: what are they but private preachers with public grievances? The grievances are going, and no private sect can hold on long without either logic or a grievance.

48. You know how often the thought has come over you like a flood, that *after all, the Roman Catholic Religion is the right one!* After all, the Catholics know what they believe, and *all believe the same thing.* After all, the Catholics put their faith before all things—even life. After all, the Catholic monks and nuns give up home and friends and the pleasures of life, as Jesus Christ taught and did, whereas no Protestant sect ever dreams of following the Man of Sorrows to the bitter end. After all, the worship of the Catholic Church is like the heavenly worship written of in Scripture. Yes—who can dictate to God what His faith shall be? You may see things you do not like, or do not understand in the Catholic religion, *but*, after all, it is “The Catholic Religion or nothing.” The *Truth* is what we want, not the *customary* or the *moderate*, but the TRUTH. The Protestant Establishment is much pleased with its moderation; it is to the world what the moderator lamp is to society, you can turn the doctrine high or low, as you require.

49. It is sometimes said that truth is what each man thinks it to be. The result is, that to John who thinks an animal is a rat, *it is a rat*; and to William who thinks it is a guinea-pig, *it is a guinea-pig*; though to itself it may be neither, John being ignorant and William short-sighted.

Questions.

50. Ask yourself the following questions, and answer them with perfect honesty:—

(1) You think your religion is true, but do you *know* it is THE ONE TRUTH?

(2) Protestants say that "the Bible and the Bible only" is the rule of faith; what becomes of this rule when Protestants do not agree as to what the Bible means?

(3) How do you know that the Bible is God's revelation, except on the authority of the Church from which you got the Bible?

(4) When and where did Christ say that each man had to find the truth for himself, by making out the meaning of the Bible?

(5) If learned men disagree as to what the Bible means, and flatly contradict each other, do you know enough Hebrew and Greek to test which of these scholars is right, and which wrong?

(6) If ten men disagree about the meaning of a document, must not nine of them be wrong?

(7) If each Protestant has to find the truth for himself, and Brown gets one inspiration, and Jones another, and Robinson a third, is it not plain that Protestantism is a collection of personal peculiarities?

(8) There are plenty of Churches with *bits* of the truth, but can there be more than one with THE WHOLE TRUTH?

(9) Christ founded a Church; does that Church exist or has it faded away?

(10) If it exists, does it teach one truth or many?

(11) How can one Church teach many and opposite doctrines without being a kingdom divided against itself?

(12) Do not contradictory doctrines destroy each other?

(13) How can a jumble of contradictory doctrines be THE ONE TRUTH?

(14) Jesus Christ founded ONE CHURCH; if we can get into that, why bother about a sect founded by Emanuel Swedenborg, Edward Irving, or John Wesley?

(15) If you say you cannot believe there is an infallible Church, how can you believe there is an infallible Bible?

(16) Is it more difficult to believe that men can *speak* infallibly through a Church, than *write* infallibly through a book?

(17) You think you cannot believe all the doctrines of the Catholic Church, but is it not far more difficult to believe all the contradictory doctrines of Protestantism?

History and Antiquity.

51. I want to put another point before you. You know that Christianity is more than a book. It is an historical fact, with a place in the history of the Roman Empire. Pontius Pilate was a Roman official. The Roman historians, Tacitus and Pliny, tell us of the measures taken by their government to put down the Christian religion. The writings of the early Christians have come down to us. Their tombs and chapels have been excavated during the present century. You have read of the catacombs or underground refuges in Rome, in which the early Christians worshipped and buried. You may have heard of the Church of St. Clement, who laboured with St. Paul. It was excavated in 1855, and is one of the most interesting buildings in the world. Though underground itself, the foundations rest on still lower layers of Roman masonry; the deepest dating from the ages of the Roman Republic. This group of buildings link together more than two thousand years of human history. There is the present Church on a level with the street, and below it the old Church of St. Clement, and below that again a heathen temple still containing figures of deities! The underground Church was destroyed nearly eight hundred years ago, and the present one built upon its ruins. On the ruined walls of the underground Church there are many paintings on plaster dating from the fifth century onwards. Now I ask you, Why did the early Christians paint frescoes in the underground Church of St. Clement of (1) The Crucifixion; (2) The Blessed Virgin and Child; (3) The Assumption; (4) The translation of the relics of St. Clement; (5) The miracle at the tomb of St. Clement?

c

52. My point is this: there are writings, and buildings, and antiquities dating back to early Christian times. These old works of art give some idea of what the early Christians understood by Christianity. If "Popery" were a new thing, there would be no trace of it in these early remains. There would be no Bishops, no relics, no vestments, no shaven heads, no prayers for the dead, no invocations of the saints, no frescoes of the crucifix, no paintings of the Blessed Virgin, no miracles at shrines—in a word, "no Popery." If the primitive Christians were like the Primitive Methodists, *we should find no trace of these Catholic practices in the early Christian remains.* As a matter of fact, *they are full of them.*

53. How could the early Christians have inscribed on the tomb of the martyr Sabbatius the words, "Sabbatius, sweet soul, pray and entreat for thy brethren and comrades," unless they had believed in the invocation of saints? How could they have inscribed on another tomb:—"Anatolinus made this monument to his well-deserving son, who lived seven years. May thy spirit rest well in God, and thou, pray for thy sister"—unless they had believed in praying for and to the dead? How could the Greek word for "Bishop" and "Priest" follow the names of the early ecclesiastics unless the early Christians had recognised Holy Orders? Why should the altars in the catacombs be placed over the tombs of the saints, excepting, as St. Jerome says, the Bishop of Rome was "offering sacrifices to the Lord over the venerable bones of Peter and Paul, and considering their tombs to be the altar of Christ"? St. Jerome was secretary to Pope Damasus, and was born A.D. 340. If you accuse him of Popery, you will have to admit that Popery was a very early Christian invention! Why are the vestments on the Bishops and Priests in these early Churches *exactly like those now used by the Catholic clergy?* There is only one answer: BECAUSE THE EXISTING CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Relics.

54. Protestants object to relics. I never heard a Protestant sermon on the following text:—

“And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them.” Acts xix. 11, 12.

It is not we who have invented relics; it is Almighty God Who has *provided them*. If He wills it once, He may will it again. It would be blasphemy to accuse Him of ever having encouraged superstition. The bones of Elisha raised the dead, the shadow of St. Peter was believed to heal the sick, and only an assumption (for which there is no proof) that God has withdrawn such benefits from His creatures would justify a want of faith in their efficacy. Some people say it is very difficult to believe that *inert matter* can convey any virtue, but these people walk by sight and not by faith. The sick woman who touched the garment of Christ trusted that the *inert matter* would convey the healing virtue. The body and soul of Jesus Christ were there: she appealed to neither; she only touched the garment. What an opportunity to crush superstition! What did our Lord do? He praised her FAITH.

The Crucifix.

55. As to the use of the Crucifix, we need go no further than the testimony of the Protestant Dr. Arnold. He wrote:—

“The second commandment is, in the letter, utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation. To refuse, then, the benefit which we might derive from the frequent use of the Crucifix, under the pretence of the second Commandment, is a folly: because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself when He declared Himself in the person of Christ.”

And no less sound a Protestant than the late Lord Shaftesbury writes in his diary:—

"At Padua, bought a small Crucifix. . . . The worship of the material or the mere representation, is senseless, wicked, and idolatrous, but to bear about a memorial of what God Himself once exhibited to the world, does but simply recall His death and passion, and forces us, as Scripture has foretold, 'to look on Him Whom we pierced.' " *

Extreme Unction.

56. Catholics who are thought to be dying receive a Sacrament called Extreme Unction. The outward sign of this is oil, with which the sick person is anointed. You may think this is some strange superstition, invented by Pope or Cardinal. As a matter of fact, it is enjoined in the Epistle of St. James, who says:—

"Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." St. James v., 14-15.

If any believer in Holy Scripture, who was ill, desired the grace thus promised him on the authority of the Word of God, for what "Elder" could he send, save the Catholic Priest? No other clergyman carries out the precept. On this point the Catholic priest is the only consistent *doer*, as well as *reader or hearer* of the Word. I have asked Protestants again and again, Why do you not anoint the sick? None of them ever gave me a satisfactory answer.

Catholic Worship.

57. Most intelligent Protestants admit that there is a devotion about a Catholic Church which no Protestant sect can imitate. The Catholic day begins by the Church offering the Eternal Sacrifice. It is the same everywhere amongst all the millions of Catholics upon the globe. There is no moment of time when the Holy Offering is

* 'Life,' by Edwin Hodder, p. 95.

not being made *somewhere*. As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so is the coming of the Son of Man. In England, Ireland, America, Australia, Africa, Japan, China, India, at the sacred shrine of the Holy Sepulchre, throughout Italy, France, Germany, Holland, and Spain; in the frozen north, in the sunny south, there is renewed the One Oblation, with *one* method of offering, *one* form of words, *one* language, *one* belief, throughout the ONE Church of God. Even those who hate the Catholic religion admit the devotion of her children. The very attitude of Catholics in their churches turns the minds of those present to something beyond. Strangers do not understand what is going on; they gape and stare, and wonder what is coming next. But this much they *do* learn, that Catholics know their religion and practise it with devotion. There is a calm subduing atmosphere in a Catholic Church because the Unseen is really there, and the attention of all present is directed to something outside of themselves. They are not concerned with the feelings of the minister as he prays. He does not pray towards them, as if it was *they* who were to be gratified; he directs his words and acts to the throne of God, and the people join in spirit as they kneel around.

58. There is much ritual, I know—vestments, candles, incense, and the like. These are strange to you, and you do not like them, and see no use in them. Well, be patient. Ritual is a question of custom and discipline. If there is a holy action to be done, it is reasonable there should be a fixed method of doing it reverently. The ritual we use is the one we have always used. We have as much reason in using our chasuble as other ministers have in using their surplice or gown. You do not blame them; why do you revile us? The fact is, you are used to the one and do not notice it, and you find the other strange, and so you despise it.

59. You do not like our worship; perhaps not, but remember there are people who do not care for yours. Indeed, you do not always like it yourselves. Some of

you spend your time and money in dragging one another into law courts on the subject. During my life I have seen enough changes in the ritual of the establishment to fill the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. I have seen an old parish clerk torn from the lowest story of a three-decker, where he led the hymns below, whilst the minister preached and prayed above; I have seen him evicted, his gown taken from him, his sacred enclosure levelled, and himself transformed into a banner-carrier and acolyte! I have seen him, in cassock and cotta, carry a cross before a procession! I have seen him swing a censer! Poor old man, it was a great change. Remember, I am not complaining. It would make no difference to me if his incumbent got preferment, and another one was appointed who stripped him of all these extras. All I say is this—it is ridiculous for those who vary their ritual so much that no man knows what it is or what it is not, to object to the Catholics, who at all times and in all places have had and do have one fixed ceremonial. Protestants ought to be modest on the subject of ceremony. It ill becomes those who have tried every form, reverent or grotesque, and *fixed on none*, to abuse the Catholics for their form which can be traced down from the earliest ages of Christianity.

60. People who do not travel but live on generation after generation in the same place, think that what they are used to must be the best, because they have had no experience of other good things. Hence, many Englishmen despise foreigners. Not long ago a lady was telling me of the dreadful influences of Popery, and enlarged upon its disastrous effects on the Italian people. I asked if she had ever been in Italy, and she admitted she had not. Did she know any Italians? No, she did not. What had she got against them? “Well,” she said, “there is no domestic life in Italy.” How she supposed that Italian families were reared *without* domestic life I know not, but being in a mischievous mood I led her on until at last she admitted that all she said was gleaned from an Anti-Popery lecture, and that of

her own knowledge she knew nothing at all. She was amazed to hear that in many domestic things the Italians are ahead of us English people. For example, in England it is the custom for the widow of a gentleman to be banished from the old home on the death of her husband, the house going to the son who succeeds. Large English estates have a dower house, as it is called, to which the mother retires. The Italians think this practice most cruel, as it is. The son turns his mother out into the world at the instant of her greatest loneliness. The common practice in Italy is the very reverse of this, and the domestic circle often includes the grandparents on both sides. Again, my friend was astonished to hear that I had lived for two months in Naples, and had not seen either a prostitute or a drunken man, except an English sailor. This good lady had not noticed that we English are one of the most abominably drunken people of all nations, and that drunkenness is a terrible sin, and the root of infinite crime and insanity. I am not insinuating that Protestantism is responsible for the drunkenness of England and Sweden, any more than Popery is responsible for the murders of Italy and Spain. Different peoples have different vices and virtues. I am only protesting against the habit of ill-informed English people thinking that Englisemen have all the virtues, and foreigners all the vices of the world; and against the ridiculous idea that the English have a monopoly of religious opinion and correct methods of devotion.

Protestant Ritual.

61. After all, What is Protestant ritual? Is it a fixed form of prayer? By no means; one sect takes one form, and another takes another, and some have none at all. People go where they feel suited. Some like extemporary prayers, others do not; they prefer to know what is coming. They would rather not be surprised into unexpected petitions. They do not care for prayers which

may or may not include their own wants. Others say that a fixed form of prayer is a cold lip service, and that **only** extemporaneous prayer comes from the heart. These last like to see the minister, to watch his face, and catch the infection of his emotion. His voice is hushed, and his hearers are subdued. He admits his own unworthiness; they deplore their sins. He pleads the merits of the Saviour; they grow confident. He calls aloud in gratitude, and they swell with exultation. We have all seen this kind of worship, and read of it in old Nonconformist magazines in days when men and women were sensibly converted by the bench-full. Messrs. Moody and Sankey and the Salvation Army have had the same effect. Such is the effect of extemporaneous prayer on some souls. I am not praising either system, but only pointing out that Protestants have fixed on neither. The only thing they are all agreed upon is that Catholics are wrong. They may have any form they like, the Catholics may not. They may have a gown, the Catholics may not have a chasuble. If the Catholic priest says the Mass quietly at the altar, though the people have the prayers before them in English in their books, it is "mummery" and "superstition," because the congregation do not vocally join; but no complaints are made against the Quakers, though they may sit through a whole meeting and not a mouth be opened! The Lutherans of Germany have an elaborate ritual. Dr. Neale tells us:—

"You would see, perhaps, five or six altars in the same church, all magnificently vested—all furnished with candlesticks—all, not with crosses, but with *crucifixes*,—images of the Saints, the tapers on the altars lighted during Divine Service, and hung, in many cases, before the images—those images garlanded with flowers."

Why not have a meeting at Exeter Hall and denounce the Lutherans? Be as logical as Henry VIII. If you denounce the followers of the Pope, denounce also the followers of Luther. Henry used to burn Catholics and Protestants at the same stake! You didn't know about the Lutherans, did you? No! and I can tell you there

is a great deal more for you to learn. All that the English Protestants have settled is: that as to Ritual they may suit themselves, but *the Catholics may not*. The Protestants may have five hundred ways of conducting their worship, *the Catholics may not have one!*

Protestantism and Art.

62. It is one of the strongest indictments against Potestantism, that it has separated the genius of man from the service of God. The poets, painters and musicians of the Catholic world have been attracted to consecrate their respective talents to the glory of their faith. Go into our National Gallery where there are two schools of painting, one of the Catholic and the other of the Protestant period. In the Catholic section almost every picture is a representation of some scene in the story of our Redemption. There is our Blessed Lord at all points of His earthly life, as the little Child, the Divine Teacher, or the crucified and risen Saviour. The Incarnate God and His Truth shines resplendent from the Catholic canvas. Walk into the Protestant galleries, and see what a change! The glory of God has given place to the exaltation of man. Portraits of kings and nobleman become the rule instead of the exception. Religious subjects become more and more rare, until in our own day they are hardly wanted. The personal vanity of man, his worldly ambitions, his battles, his amours, his wives and daughters, his sumptuous dwellings, his horses, dogs, cattle and food. Some artists seem to have spent nearly the whole of their lives in painting groups of countrymen drinking at public houses. Others appear to have gloried in raking up all the filthy and abominable fables out of heathen writers. These are the glorious themes of the ages of light! Thus have the arts of painting and sculpture, which are amongst the noblest endowments of man, become divorced from the service of religion, and degraded into the agents of the world. The enemies of the cross

have rejoiced at the separation between religion and art. They want the services of all the arts. I have heard modern painters of pious inclination bitterly lament their fate. They must paint what is wanted or starve. The Puritanical mother is horrified at the naked figures on the walls of the Academy, but it is she who has helped to hang them there. The artist would rather paint for her a view of the home at Nazareth, but she will not employ him to do so.

63. How different has been the attitude and instinct of the Catholic Church towards the artistic endowments of man! She recognises in them the gifts of God. By giving them her work to do she sanctifies them in her service. She does not turn the painter or sculptor or musician into the theatre or music hall, where they become the slaves of the world; she directs their genius to the highest objects, and hallows the inspiration of their minds and the work of their hands.

Catholic Music.

64. Some Protestants complain about the instrumental music in Catholic worship. They wander into one of our great churches on a festival day, whilst the choir is performing some master-piece by Beethoven or Haydn. They hear voices accompanied by an orchestra, as the composer meant them to be. The Protestant at once sniffs mischief, and says "*that the whole thing is nothing more or less than a regular opera.*" To the Protestant, harps and hautboys sound like the theatre. In his ears the harmonium and organ are *sacred*, but trumpets and violins ungodly. He does not see that the sound of a reed played by human lips can be heard as easily at the throne of God; as when the wind is pumped through the same pipe, from bellows blown by an attendant in shirt-sleeves and needy circumstances. Common sense favours the system most immediately under command of human intelligence. It is fortunate that, though we be little, God is great, and that His kindly

ears are closed against no well-meant effort to accompany the singing of His praises ; that His heart is turned with equal favour towards the inspiring orchestra, the solemn and stately organ, or the humble harmonium ; and that it is only ignorant prejudice which would take the harps out of the hands of God's singers on earth, whilst His angels are giving them to the elect in heaven.

65. The prejudice of some Protestants knows no bounds. Watch a prejudiced Protestant in a Catholic church abroad. See him defiant, guide-book in hand, standing boldly between the congregation and the high altar. Or see him suspicious, peeping behind or prying into a sacristy or confessional. His face bears an expression of pity mingled with contempt. At the moment of consecration a bell is rung in the sanctuary to let those in the remote portions of the building know that the solemn act is completed. The prejudiced Protestant smiles, nodding his head and saying "There it is, all superstition and bell-ringing." I am not inventing such a scene ; I have seen it again and again on the continent. *Bell-ringing!* He thinks we worship with a bell! *Bell-ringing!* Yes, *our* bell must be wrong, wherever and whenever it rings. Protestants may pull away at a belfry full of metal, but the tinkle of a Catholic bell is superstition! A bell up in a belfry is orthodox, lower it thirty feet into the chancel and it is gross superstition. "But it *is* superstition," says the prejudiced Protestant. "Is it?" I reply; "then perhaps you will tell me *why* we ring it?" The rest is silence; he has not the ghost of a notion. The fact is, some of our prayers are said silently. We have them before us in Latin and English in our books, and can follow them, or say any devotion suited to our needs at the time. We are expected however to join with the priest at the solemn moments of the service, and the bell is rung for the practical purpose of telling us that those moments have arrived.

The Communion of Saints.

66. What is it that Protestants object to in the Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints? Is it that we ask others to pray for us? That cannot be, for St. Paul says, "Brethren, pray for us." Is it because we ask those in *heaven* to pray for us? How can this be wrong, when St. John tells us that an angel stands before the throne of God offering up "the prayers of all Saints?"* I have tried to get at the groundwork of the Protestant objections to our asking the Saints to pray for us, and I find they generally centre round two things. First of all there is an idea that if we ask St. Paul to pray for us we set up another Mediator beside Christ. Another notion is that these friends of God are shut up in a place where they cannot hear us, or know what is going on here on earth.

67. As to any interference with the One Mediation of Christ, is it not plain that if a child asks its mother to pray for it, that mother interferes with Christ's One Mediation just as much as St. Paul would if I could get him to pray to God for me? The truth is, Catholics and Protestants are in the same boat. Both believe there is only One Mediator, and both allow Christians to pray for one another. The Protestants confine themselves to the Church on earth; we include the Church in Heaven. That is what it comes to, and both of us have got to explain *how there can be only One Mediator for us all, and yet that we can all mediate for one another.*

I want you to have by you always the following Catholic explanation by our good Bishop Hay:—

Q. Why is Jesus Christ called our Mediator?

A. Because He is truly the Mediator of God and man in the most perfect sense of the word. A mediator is one who acts between two, either to obtain pardon, or to procure some benefit from the one for the other. Now a mediator may obtain this pardon or benefit either as a right in justice by paying an equivalent

* Rev. viii., 3.

price, or as a favour through prayer and intercession. Man by sin has grievously offended God, and was an object of His wrath and indignation ; Jesus Christ appears as a Mediator to obtain pardon from God to man ; to purchase this He paid a price of infinite value, the merits of all His sufferings, and death upon the Cross, by which He acquired a right and title, in justice, to demand the pardon from His Father, and all other graces for us ; but that nothing might be wanting to the perfection of His Mediatorship, to His sufferings and death He also joined most fervent prayers for the same end. Hence the Scripture says :—"Therefore He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of His death, etc. ;" "And, in the days of His flesh, offering up prayers and supplications with a loud cry," etc. By the former He is the Mediator of Redemption, and *the only Mediator between God and man* ; by the latter He is also a Mediator of intercession, but so that He has a right in His own person to claim what He asks for us as His own due." When one man intercedes with God for another, He is also a mediator of intercession, but such a one *has no right or title in himself* to demand what he prays for, but must expect to be heard only through mercy and favour ; yea, *he can look for these only in and through the merits of Jesus Christ* ; so that all good to man must come from that source above, whatever be the immediate instrument or means of applying for it.*

This is genuine Catholic teaching. How different from the caricature given at a "No Popery" meeting!

68. As to the idea that the Saints cannot hear us, this is entirely due to modern materialism. The thought of living in the presence of God is not one that is common now-a-days. Catholic children are brought up to it. They are trained to see heaven always open, and the angels of God coming and going from the throne of the Most High. This doctrine is made most plain in Holy Scripture. Christianity began with the visit of an angel to a Jewish maiden, and it will end its mission on earth with the second coming of Christ in company with all His Saints. Our Lord says :—

"Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones ; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven."*

Nothing can be clearer. The angels are told by God

* *Sincere Christian*, Vol. I., ch. ix. † St. Matt. xviii., 10.

to guard the little ones on earth, and they will vindicate these children at the throne of the Most High. If you believe the Gospel you must not only admit that these words mean what they *do* mean, but you must thank God for the blessing. Your children have angels of their own, and Christ says so. Why are Protestants silent on the subject?

69. Again, Christ says "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." * How could the angels rejoice unless all that takes place, even in the bottom of our hearts, were known to them? Those who see God, see everything He reveals to them, and He tells us that our good estate is their constant concern. When Abraham said to the rich man in hell, "They have Moses and the Prophets;" † he showed that he knew all that passed upon earth, for he died hundreds of years before Moses or the prophets were born. Nothing can be plainer than the Bible as to the office of Angels. The angels of the Lord, sings the Psalmist, "excel in strength, do His commandments, and hearken unto the voice of His word." ‡ The Book of Samuel speaks of one who was wise "according to the wisdom of an angel of God, *to know all things that are in the earth.*" "Are they not all," asks St. Paul, "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" §

70. Here we have from the Word of God three most important facts: (1) That Almighty God is surrounded by a countless multitude of powerful and wise celestial beings; (2) that these angels know "all things that are in the earth;" and (3) that they minister to the "heirs of salvation." The Protestants put the angels into their poetry, but say very little about them in the Sunday School. Some may say, "No doubt there are angels, who are God's ministers; but we have no right to speak to them, or ask their help." Why not? "Because we must trust in God alone, and speak to Him only."

* St. Luke xv., 10.

† St. Luke xv., 10.

‡ Ps. ciii., 20.

§ Heb. i., 14.

71. Let us see if this is supported by Scripture. First, it is clear that God has promised to give His Angels charge over us. Next, we have in the book of Exodus a direct order given to the Hebrews:—

“Behold I send an Angel before thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him *and obey his voice*, provoke him not : for he will not pardon your transgressions : for My name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak ; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries.”*

Does this passage, or does it not, suppose intercommunication ?

72. When Agar fled into the wilderness, it was an Angel who reproved and consoled her. An Angel brought food to Elijah. An Angel shut the mouths of the lions that were to tear Daniel in pieces. When Jacob wrestled with the Angel, he said, “I will not let thee go except thou bless me.” It was an Angel who conducted Lot out of Sodom, and to him Lot said, “Behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast shewed unto me in saving my life.” At the appearance of Angels, Abraham and Lot bowed themselves to the ground. It was an Angel whom Joshua met by the walls of Jericho, “the Captain of the Host of the Lord,” “and Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him. What saith my Lord unto his servant ?” An Angel ministered to our Lord in the garden. An Angel brought the Apostles forth from prison. An Angel delivered Peter from the dungeon ; and Angels carried Lazarus into the bosom of Abraham.

73. If, then, our Father has blessed us with this ministry of angels ; if there is communion between the saints in Heaven and on earth ; if Patriarchs have spoken with them, and venerated them ; if Saints have invoked their blessing, as did St. John when he called down grace from “the seven Spirits which are before His Throne,”* upon the churches of Asia ; if the bosom

* Exod. xxiii., 20.

† Rev. i. 4.

of one is a home for the souls of the faithful, surely we Catholics, who look to them with love and confidence, knowing from Christ's own words that they will vindicate us before the face of God—surely we have good ground for our faith, and good reason for our love?

The Church Triumphant.

74. And with these, we gather up the countless multitude of the spirits of just men made perfect, who now gaze upon the face of Christ. They have come from every tribe and tongue, to sing the glory of the Lamb. Their eyes are bent upon His pierced hands and feet and side. Their hearts and tongues know only one theme—the praise of His redeeming blood. His love is their love, His sympathies are their sympathies, and they share His triumphs, as they endured His tribulations. If we are the objects of His love and sympathy, so are we of theirs. Whatever He wishes for us, they desire also. They rejoice over our repentance, they participate in our praises, and they offer up our prayers. St. John saw them bearing harps and golden vials full of odours, “which are the prayers of the Saints.”

You see Holy Scripture tells us that the Angels are engaged in a practice which is abused at every Protestant lecture as interfering with the One Mediation of Christ.

The Blessed Virgin.

75. Amongst that blessed throng of redeemed humanity are those whom God chose to take a special part with Him in our Redemption: and the most intimate of all these is the Mother of the Redeemer. It is said that Catholics honour the Mother of Christ too much, but who could ever exalt her as highly as God Himself has done? To her He sent an angel, who declared that she was “full of *grace*.” In her virginal womb, through the over-shadowing of God the Holy Ghost, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity was

made man. From her pure body the man Christ Jesus received the flesh and blood with which He redeemed the world. She held her Creator within her breast, and fed at her bosom Him Who sustains the illimitable universe of things visible and invisible. Some say we ask too much of her. Ah! they forget what Almighty God has condescended to accept at her hands. She had free will, and she might have withheld those words, "Be it done unto me according to Thy word." But she chose to accept the office given her by God, and, inspired by the Holy Ghost, she said, "ALL GENERATIONS SHALL CALL ME BLESSED." As all generations have bitterly lamented the fall of Eve, so all Catholics have rejoiced in the grace given to Mary. If you believe in original sin, if you lament that the new-born babe brings with it a share in the *moral fall* of Eve, you ought to rejoice in the moral elevation of the Blessed Virgin. In Mary is fulfilled the prophecy of God to the serpent concerning the woman, "She shall crush thy head." Eve was the instrument of all our moral misfortunes, and Mary is the immediate instrument of our moral recovery.

76. It is said that we worship the Virgin as if she were a goddess. Can you suppose we are so brutish as not to see that between the Creator and any creature there is fixed an infinite and impassable gulf? The One God, Creator of the Universe, is the supreme source of all things; and the light that shines upon Mary, the most blessed of His creatures (*and only a creature*) is all reflected from Him. We worship the majesty of God, but that does not prevent us running to ask His earthly Mother to use her influence in our behalf. He emptied Himself and became our Brother, and His Mother is ours. He has taken with Him to the right hand of God our humanity, and the human love He felt for His Mother still burns within His Sacred Heart. With Him she shares all His longings for our salvation, for between His Heart and hers there is the harmony of perfect love. Can you doubt it? Think as you read this. The eyes of the Saviour are bent upon you. He wants you to

become like Him, to love what He loves, and honour what He honours. Imitate Him then in love for His Mother. He desires your faith in His incarnation; in the union between God and man, which took place in the womb of that Blessed Mother. Yes—and faith that the grace which God gave to her on earth, to enable her to correspond with His intentions concerning our salvation, will still help us before the throne of the Majesty on high, where all her longings for our good are magnified and made mighty in the glory of her Creator, her Redeemer, and her King.

Confession.

77. What are the Protestant objections to Confession? The act is so simple they must be easy to discover. Do Protestants object to our telling one another of our faults? This cannot be, for the Holy Ghost says, by the mouth of St. James, “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.”* Therefore the act of disclosing our sins to our fellow Christians is enjoined in the Word of God, and those who never perform it are such as hear the Word of God and *do not keep it*. When St. John Baptist preached the “Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,” there went out unto him all the land of Judæa, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river Jordan, *confessing their sins*.† The practice of Confession existed under the Jewish dispensation, before the Christian Church was founded, and has been continued in the Church ever since.

78. If, then, the confession of the sinner to his fellow man is supported by the authority of Holy Scripture, the only other matter which the Protestant can object to is the absolution of the Priest. Unfortunately for the Protestant, the words of Christ are so clear on this point that he can only support his case by repudiating

* St. James v., 16.

† St. Mark i., 5.

the plain sense of plain words. Our Lord said to His Apostles :—

“Receive ye the Holy Ghost : Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”*

I have heard people try to wriggle out of the obvious sense of the words of Scripture, but here *it is impossible*. Jesus Christ gave the power of absolution to His Apostles, or these words are without an intellectual equivalent. The Protestant Establishment even has no sort of doubt upon the subject. Her bishops repeat the words when they ordain her ministers. If you want to see what the Establishment holds as to confession and absolution, read the service for the Visitation of the Sick. The rubric in the Prayer Book says :—

“Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it), after this sort.”

Now look at the form of absolution :—

“OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, WHO HATH LEFT POWER TO HIS CHURCH TO ABSOLVE ALL SINNERS WHO TRULY REPENT AND BELIEVE IN HIM, OF HIS GREAT MERCY FORGIVE THEE THINE OFFENCES ; AND BY HIS AUTHORITY, COMMITTED TO ME, I ABSOLVE THEE FROM ALL THY SINS, IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST. AMEN.”

79. Christ gave His Apostles the absolving power in perfectly plain words. If that power perished with those who received it, then we have a means of grace the less than the first Christians, and the promises of the Lord are not fulfilled. Protestants sometimes say that the Confessional is a source of immorality. If so, is it not singular that there are to be found amongst Englishmen holding the most exalted offices of trust—judges, such as Mr. Justice Mathew and Mr. Justice

* St. John xx., 22, 23.

Day; statesmen, such as Lord Ripon, Sir Charles Russell, and the late Home Secretary; writers, such as Coventry Patmore, Aubrey de Vere, and St. George Mivart; is it not strange, I say, that these men, who have a practical knowledge of the confessional, do not confirm your testimony who have no personal knowledge of it whatever? These men have been brought up in this system. Their wives and daughters have been educated in convents. Do you think they are parties to a pious fraud, and the sheltering of immorality behind a religious practice? Those English Protestants who talk about the immoralities of the Catholic Church would do better if they exhibited a little modesty.

Be Modest.

80. It is the habit of Protestant lecturers to assume that Catholics have all the spiritual vices, and Protestants all the virtues. This is very far from the truth. I recommend you to look to the beam in your own eye. Protestants did their share of burning for religious opinion in the sixteenth century, whilst they preached liberty of conscience! One Protestant historian says that Queen Elizabeth committed more brutalities of this kind in one year than the Spanish Inquisition did during the whole of its existence. The Penal Laws, which made the practice of the Catholic religion *felony*, have only recently been repealed. Twenty-five Protestant Bishops voted against Catholic Emancipation; there is Protestant liberty of conscience for you! Twenty Protestant Bishops voted against the Jews entering Parliament; there is Protestant liberty of conscience for you! Twenty-two Protestant Bishops voted against the Nonconformists enjoying the Universities; there is Protestant liberty of conscience for you! What did the Protestant Establishment do for the abolition of slavery? I can give you a series of Papal decrees against traffic in human beings from the earliest ages downwards. What about the present absolutely

unchristian divorce law of England? What about the destruction distributed amongst the inferior races of mankind by the Protestant power of England. What about the unjust wars, the robbery of territory, the introduction of drink and immorality, the traffic in opium, alcohol, and idolatry?

81. "In India," says Mr. Campbell, "for a very long period, Government regarded and treated Christianity as *a most dangerous innovation*." The Church Missionary Society complained that the English Government *discouraged native Christians*. For the sake of gain and trade, the Protestant Government of England *discouraged Christianity*. Government officials reaped large gains from the pilgrim taxes connected with the idol Juggernaut. A Protestant missionary wrote: "Christian England is the main support of idolatry in this country." Mr. Howitt said:—"The disgusting and gory worship of Juggernaut was not only practised but was actually licensed and patronised by the English Government. It imposed a tax on all pilgrims going to the temples in Orissa and Bengal, appointed British officers, British gentlemen, to superintend the management of this hideous worship and the receipts of its proceeds." The *Calcutta Review* says that "Down to 1841, more than £400,000 a year passed through the hands of the Madras Government in connection with heathen temples, and the annual *profit* was £17,000." "The conduct of Protestant England in India," says a Protestant clergyman, "*is without parallel in the history of the Christian religion*." Surely, surely, Protestants should be modest.

Protestant Moral Theology.

82. If you want to know what private interpretation of Holy Scripture will lead men to say, let me show you only this one example. Persons calling themselves Christians have held that faith is sufficient, without good works, for justification. Once elected to eternal life, once assured of salvation, it does not matter what we do. John Wesley did warn his followers, "Take heed to

your doctrine! We have leaned too much towards Calvinism." It was time he spoke. A Methodist, by the name of Hill, is cited in Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism* as asserting

"That even adultery and murder do not hurt the pleasant children, but rather work for their good: God sees no sin in believers, whatever sins they may commit. My sins may displease God, my person is always acceptable to Him. Though I should outsin Manasses, I should not be less a pleasant child, because God always views me in Christ. Hence, in the midst of adulteries, murders, and incests, He can address me with, 'Thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled: there is no spot in thee.'"

This is the Protestant Gospel according to Mr. Hill, and no doubt its author would have given us a peck of texts from Scripture to prove it divine. I do not know what effect the passage will have upon you, reader; but if I were a Protestant, it would make me feel modest about denouncing the immoral teachings of the Catholic Church! And yet I am told that this horrible Calvinistic doctrine is still clung to.

The Penal Laws.

83. Protestants boast of their "Liberty of Conscience," and Catholics are wont to cry out, "Why have you not granted it to us?" The Penal Laws of Protestant England were a disgrace to humanity. Hear the verdict upon them from a few illustrious Protestant writers.

Hallam writes:—

"To have exterminated the Catholics by the sword or expelled them like the Moriscos of Spain, would have been little more repugnant to justice and humanity, but incomparably more politic."

Edmund Burke said of the penal code:—

"It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

Mr. Matthew Arnold wrote :—

“That penal code, of which the monstrosity is not half-known to Englishmen, and may be studied by them with profit.”

The Rev. Sydney Smith wrote :—

“It [the penal code] reflects indelible disgrace upon the English character.”

And, so recently as 1892, the Lord Chief Justice spoke of the penal laws as

“a code as hateful as anything ever seen since the foundation of the world.”*

For cold-blooded brutality, going on through generations, give me the Protestant Penal Laws. Catholics were actually punished for keeping the faith that their fathers had taught them!

84. Yes, and this is not over yet. The ill-educated portions of English society are still prejudiced against Catholics. Converts whom I have known have been disinherited and turned out of their homes. Some I have seen in terrible poverty. Clergymen of cultivation and refinement, too conscientious to eat the bread of the Establishment and not believe in its theology, have been driven to menial work and bitter privation. Girls have been hunted out of employment in shops, and boys repudiated by their parents. O Liberty, what persecutions have been done in thy name! Amongst educated people things have greatly improved. In London the prejudice is going or gone. In small country towns there is still great narrowness, but this is mostly confined to ministers who feel it their duty to go to “No Popery” lectures, and to ladies who have not read much.

Will England become Catholic?

85. Why not? If thousands of educated Protestants have returned to the Church, millions may do the same. Arguments strong enough to convince such intellects as those of Cardinals Newman and Manning, the three brothers of Bishop Wilberforce, Lord Ripon, and Adelaide

* Times, Nov. 10, 1892.

Anne Procter, may move anyone. The faith for which the Blessed Sir Thomas More died, is a faith that the noblest Englishman may be proud to profess. We do not know much of the private life of Shakespeare, but according to the tradition of Davies "he died a Papist." The poet Dryden was a convert to the Catholic Church. The poet Pope was a Catholic also. When Boswell said to Dr. Johnson, "So, sir, you are no great enemy to the Roman Catholic religion?" Johnson replied, "No more, sir, than to the Presbyterian religion." And when Boswell added, "You are joking," Dr. Johnson retorted, "No, sir; I really think so. Nay, sir, of the two, I prefer the Popish." These great minds could not have thought the Catholic religion against the moral development of mankind.

It remains to be seen whether God in His mercy will restore to England the harmony of the One Faith which she possessed for a thousand years. That He may is the prayer of every earnest Catholic.

Signs of the Times.

86. And I see signs of a leaning towards the Catholic Faith in England. Not only have thousands of conversions taken place, amongst men and women of intellect, but public opinion is more fair than it has ever been for three hundred years. To compare the tone of the newspapers to-day with that of fifty years ago is to find a huge change for the better. On all sides the extreme Protestant party are shrieking aloud at the general tendency "Romeward." These would not call out unless they were hurt.

The presence in England, since Catholic Emancipation, of a large body of well educated Catholic clergy, has called out a new set of weapons amongst their opponents. Man for man, the old-fashioned Protestant parson has proved no match for the trained Catholic priest. There has sprung up a library of Anglo-Protestant theology, nearly all of it fifty per cent. more Catholic than that used at the commencement of the century. The

work of publicly denouncing the Catholic Church on the platform is no longer undertaken by the educated Established Bishops and Clergy, but is left to inferior men, in needy circumstances.

87. It has often occurred to me that one of the signs of England gradually returning to the Catholic faith, is the care with which she is preserving the relics of her old Catholic days. The last act of Puritanism, in separating itself from the Catholic Church, was to break down the carved work thereof with axes and hammers, but the present generation has spent millions in restoring the fabrics of the great Catholic shrines. At Westminster, St. Alban's, and elsewhere, new figures of the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles and Saints have replaced those torn down by our Puritan ancestors. Compare the hymn books now in use with those of forty years ago. Look at *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. Very many of the hymns are translated from the Catholic Breviary. Another large section, such as "Pilgrims of the night," "O Paradise," "Sweet Saviour, bless us ere we go," &c., are the works of our own gifted Father Faber. Protestant hymn Books are getting more and more Catholic.

88. Outside the Establishment, amongst the Nonconformist bodies, there is active thinking on theology. The fierce fight is between free-thought and *some* fixed theology.

The demand for definite teaching has not affected these bodies as it has the Establishment. Still, they have had to abandon the uncomfortable idea that religion was advanced by hideous buildings and drab-coloured walls. The British public has got over its puritanism in that respect. A hundred years ago the Nonconformists built rectangular chapels, which set at defiance every tradition of ecclesiastical architecture. They denied to their temples even the beauty of holiness. There was no lack of honour paid to the homes of men, but it was supposed that the House of God ought to be as bare as possible. In their anxiety not to worship the works of men's hands, they surrounded themselves during

their worship with those least likely to attract their hearts or stimulate their emotions. Now-a-days the tendency is all the other way. The public taste has changed, and men are beginning to think that the beauties of God's creation were given in order to lead us to Him. Hence we see Nonconformist chapels built in an imitation of Gothic churches. Stained-glass windows, elaborate music, painted walls, and "flower services," are heard of everywhere. Even sacred plays and dialogues are introduced, after the manner of the old Catholic "Mysteries."

History Re-written.

89. Then there is the educated and important literary world of historians and statesmen. See how they have changed ! History is turned upside down. When I first went to school, Good Queen Bess and Henry VIII. "of blessed memory" were models and heroes. Now they are more justly valued. Green's *Short History of the English People* is the text-book of all schools, and he writes of Queen Elizabeth :—

"Nothing is more revolting in the Queen, but nothing is more characteristic, than her shameless mendacity. It was an age of political lying, but in the profusion and recklessness of her lies, Elizabeth stood without a peer in Christendom."

Of Henry VIII.'s reign he writes :—

"A reign of terror, organized with consummate and merciless skill, held England panic-stricken at Henry's feet. The noblest heads rolled on the block. Virtue and learning could not save Thomas More ; royal descent could not save Lady Salisbury. The execution of queen after queen taught England that nothing was too high for Henry's 'courage,' or too sacred for his 'appetite.' Parliament assembled only to sanction acts of unscrupulous tyranny, or to build up by its own statutes the great fabric of absolute rule. All the constitutional safeguards of English freedom were swept away. Arbitrary taxation, arbitrary legislation, arbitrary imprisonment were powers claimed without dispute and unsparingly exercised by the crown."

These opinions have completely changed the attitude

of educated minds towards the religious revolution of the 16th century. They have yet to do their work upon the middle classes of England. It seems a small matter, but to me it is significant, that such a writer as John Ruskin should have withdrawn from the new edition of his great work, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, what he calls "the pieces of rabid and utterly false Protestantism," which were charges against the Catholic Church.

The Unprejudiced Public.

90. In writing to Protestants I have confined my arguments to those who accept Revelation. But there is a large class outside the Catholic Church, who have no Protestant prejudices, and who, like Dr. Johnson, rather prefer the Catholic to any other form of faith. These are generally men of no belief. They walk by sight, and not by faith. They can give no account of the eternal past, nor solution of the everlasting future. Some of them say there was a Genesis of slime, out of which eventually grew Moses, Socrates, Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, Botticelli, Bach, St. Francis Xavier, Shakespeare, and Newton. But these great minds did not hold this theory themselves, and some of them gave the best reasons yet given for the existence of God and a future life. However, the followers of science and philosophy are more kind to the Catholic religion than many Protestants. They place the Catholic Church in the same boat with all the rest of the sects. Such men generally put to me the following questions:—

1. Do you not condemn all who do not believe with you?

2. Do you not want to throw the world back into the dark ages, and intellectually and politically retard the human mind?

3. Do you not want to curtail the religious liberty we all now enjoy in England?

4. Are you not at the mercy of a Pope who may propose to you matters in faith and morals contrary to the very revealed word of God on which he founds his claim to your allegiance ?

91. In answer to the first question—Do we not condemn all who do not believe with us ? I say, *we do not*. How can we condemn a man for not believing that of which he has not even heard ? We say, “This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully and steadfastly, he cannot be saved,” but it would be silly to suppose that we refer to Bosjesmen, who have never had the doctrine put before them. St. Paul said of the man who preached another Gospel than he had preached, “*let him be accursed.*” It is plain that the condemnation could not have referred to the aborigines of America. Pope Pius IX. has laid down most clearly the mind of the Catholic Church on this subject, in the following words :—

“Far be it from us to dare to set bounds to the boundless mercy of God ; far be it from us to desire to search into the depths of the hidden counsels and judgments of God, an abyss that the mind of man cannot explore . . . We must hold as of faith that out of the Apostolic Roman Church there is no salvation ; that she is the only ark of safety, and whosoever is not in her perishes in the deluge ; we must also, on the other hand, recognise with certainty that those who are in invincible ignorance of the true religion are not guilty for this in the eye of the Lord. And who will presume to mark out the limits of this ignorance according to the character and diversity of people, countries, minds, and the rest ?”

Again :—

“It is known to us and to you that those who die in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, but who observe carefully the natural law and the precepts graven by God upon the hearts of all men, and who, being disposed to obey God, lead an honest and upright life, may, aided by the light of divine grace, attain to eternal life ; for God, Who sees clearly, searches and knows the heart, the disposition, the thoughts and intentions of each, in His supreme mercy and goodness by no means permits that anyone suffer eternal punishment who has not of his own free will fallen into sin.”

This, then, is my answer to the first question, that no soul can be condemned for not believing that of which it is ignorant, and that no man can measure the limits of the uncovenanted mercies of the Most High.

92. As to the second question—Do I not want to return to the Dark Ages, and intellectually and politically retard the human mind? I am amused at the assumption contained in the words *Dark Ages*. What is intellectual and political light? Are the arts of life any standard of intellectual light? Was it a Dark Age which produced Dante, perhaps the first of all poets? What about St. Thomas Aquinas, of whom Professor Huxley says that he was a man whose “matchless grasp and subtlety of intellect seem almost without a parallel?” Canon Farrar writes:—

“Once more, consider what the Church did for *Education*. Her ten thousand monasteries kept alive and transmitted that torch of learning which otherwise would have been extinguished long before. A religious education, incomparably superior to the mere athleticism of the noble’s hall, was extended to the meanest serf who wished for it. This fact alone, by proclaiming the dignity of the individual, elevated the entire hopes and destinies of the race.”

To whom are you indebted for Oxford and Cambridge? Why, to the “Dark Ages,” during which was laid almost every foundation there existing. What about architecture, sculpture, and painting? The Cockney contractor who copies the tracery of the Catholic cathedral, and spoils the borrowed peacock’s plume by sticking it into the sparrow’s tail that he is erecting at £2 a sitting: *he* talks about the Dark Ages; yes, that is as it should be. John Ruskin truly says:—

“It is evident that the title ‘Dark Ages,’ given to the mediæval centuries, is, respecting art, wholly inapplicable. They were, on the contrary, the bright ages; ours are the dark ones. I do not mean metaphorically, but literally. They were the ages of gold; ours are the ages of umber.”

93. And as to politics. How can those who are struggling to better the condition of the poor speak with

contempt of the "Dark Ages?" The historian Hallam, who wrote much against the Catholic Church, admits:—

"There is one very unpleasing remark which everyone who attends to the subject of prices will be induced to make, that the labouring classes, especially those engaged in agriculture, *were better provided with the means of subsistence in the reign of Edward III. and of Henry VI. than they are at present.*"

The workhouse, thank God, was unknown. The monasteries were the Schools and Hospitals of the poor. Every village had its common lands, and every villager his birthright in pasture and arable. The poorest boy in England might rise to the highest office of state, because of the part the Church played in educating the poor. Those who have not read history, imagine that our modern reforms are new inventions. We are given County Councils, but we had them in the "Dark Ages" for hundreds of years. People talk about allotments, but these are poor substitutes for the people's common lands of the "Dark Ages." The modern Liberal forgets that the expenses of Members of Parliament were paid during the "Dark Ages." The Parish Vestry, which some would like to restore, was a real *power* all through the "Dark Ages." The Parliament of Ireland, which men now strive to restore, was in full activity through 600 years of the "Dark Ages." My reply, therefore, is, that those who have studied art and politics most, spend nearly all their time in returning to the "Dark Ages."

94. Now as to question 3—Do I not want to curtail the religious liberty we all now enjoy in England?

No, I do not. We Catholics have had a hard fight for our own emancipation, and we fought for the liberties of all Nonconformists. We can point with triumph to the Catholic state of Maryland, founded by the Catholic Lord Baltimore, and the statutes of religious liberty passed by its Council, when Protestant Nonconformists were flying from all sides to its kindly protection. When this scene of Catholic liberty was broken up by a Puritan revolt, a reign of Protestant "liberty" began,

and Quakers had their ears cut off, and their tongues seared with red-hot irons. Women were whipped, and men were hanged. As for talking about the days of Elizabeth and Mary, what is the good of that? Both parties hanged, burned, and disembowelled, as a matter of course. Here is what Cardinal Manning said about England of to-day :—

“I trust the day will never come when any one section or sect among us shall gain a domination over the equities which render tolerable our divided state. I hope no Puritans will rise up again to do in England, by the help of secularists and unbelievers, what they did in Maryland. There they destroyed the fairest promise of peace that a wrecked world ever saw. England at this time is Maryland upon an imperial scale. *He who shall break our religious peace will go down to history with those whose names Englishmen try to forget.*”

95. And, once more, as to question 4—Am I not at the mercy of a Pope who may propose things contrary to the faith and morals of the revealed Word of God? I reply in the words of Cardinal Turrecremata, quoted to Mr. Gladstone by Cardinal Newman :—

“Although it clearly follows from the circumstance that the Pope can err at times, and command things which must not be done, that we are not to be simply obedient to him in all things, that does not show that he must not be obeyed by all when his commands are good. To know in what cases he is to be obeyed and in what not . . . it is said in the Acts of the Apostles, ‘One ought to obey God rather than man;’ therefore, were the Pope to command anything against Holy Scripture, or the articles of faith, or the truth of the Sacraments, or the commands of the natural or divine law, *he ought not to be obeyed*, but in such commands to be passed over.”

When the Pope issues unscriptural commands, it will be time enough for his children to rebel.

Conclusion.

96. And now I have done. I should never have set pen to paper were we Catholics treated as if we were entitled with others to liberty of conscience. But those

who are supposed to preach the Gospel of mutual charity proclaim in open meeting that we encourage immorality and teach theft on principle. This is said, or listened to in silent approval by those who know us personally, and profess a Christian charity to our faces which seems to somewhat abate behind our backs. Why should not those who are disposed to be liberal and fair to other opponents be liberal and fair to us? Why should they dress up a puppet called "Popery," in all the dirty rags that can be found, and dandle it before those who know no better, and thus prejudice people against us? Before ever they or their Denominations were dreamed of, we had for a thousand years taught to the succeeding generations of English men and women the existence of God, the precepts of His moral law, the Redemption of Christ, the hope of heaven, and the fear of hell. And we now hold up before the people of this country, amidst the confusion of Church and Chapel, High and Low, anything and nothing, the spectacle of an undivided Christian community, the Mystical Body of Christ, the One Church of God.*

* The writer thinks it well to state that he has used the Protestant version of Holy Scripture, for the convenience of his readers.



WHY I LEFT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

BY JAMES BRITTEN,

Hon. Sec Catholic Truth Society.

I WISH to begin this lecture with an apology. No one can be better aware than I am that, except to one person—myself—the reasons which impel me to any course of action are of the very slightest importance—or rather, of no importance at all. This lecture is, like others of our course, the sequence of one delivered lately in this neighbourhood in connection with the Protestant Alliance: the title is an adaptation of that adopted on the former occasion; and the fact that, up and down the country, various people, including more or less escaped nuns and others, are telling audiences—sometimes large ones—why they “left the Church of Rome,” seems to show that the experiences of what used to be called ‘verts are still attractive.

The reasons which people allege for leaving one Communion and joining another are very various, and sometimes very curious. Mr. Fitzgerald, for example, said he became a Protestant because of the ignorance

* A Lecture delivered in March, 1893, in St. George’s School-room, Southwark, in connection with the St. George’s Branch of the Catholic Truth Society, in answer to one given by a Mr. Fitzgerald, of the Protestant Alliance. The lecture is published in compliance with the wishes of some who heard it, and of the Committee of the C.T.S.

of the Catholic clergy and the worship of images. Well, as to ignorance, those who heard Mr. Fitzgerald will agree with me in thinking that he is hardly a competent judge; and as to the worship of images, supposing for one moment, what every Catholic will resent as an impossibility, that Catholics fell into so gross a sin, I would remark that the Jewish people more than once did the same, without thereby ceasing to be the people of God. Another Protestant lecturer was so shocked by the definition of Papal Infallibility in 1870, that she—at once left the Church? O dear no! remained in it for eighteen years, and then withdrew. A Nonconformist friend of mine told me the other day, that his sister had joined the Church of England. "You see," he said, "she is a wise woman. She told me she found that if her daughters were to mix in the best society, they must be Church people, so she and her husband joined the Establishment." Another friend, who had been a Baptist all his life, suddenly joined the Established Church. "The fact of it was," he said to me, "they were always quarrelling at the chapel, so one day I said I'd had enough of it, and I took the girls off to church—and now I've had them confirmed there, and we like it." I do not think these were good reasons for changing one's belief; my object however, is not to criticise other people's reasons, but to give you my own, and this I will proceed to do without further delay.

One thing only I will add—an assurance that I am most anxious to avoid anything which can in any way hurt the feelings of those who differ from me. I have no reason, indeed, for speaking harshly or disrespectfully of the Church of England. To one section of it I owe my training in many Catholic doctrines: while to another section I am indebted for having opened my eyes to the fact that those doctrines were not the doctrines of the Church of England. You will hear from me no attacks upon the character of the Anglican clergy, not only because I believe them to be an excellent body of men, but because, even if they were not so, their personal shortcomings would no more invalidate their teaching than

the character of Balaam prevented the truth of his prophetic utterances. It would, I think, be well if some Protestant lecturers would bear this in mind, just as they might remember that a Church which could claim the allegiance of a Newman, a Manning, and many more who were once Anglican clergymen, is hardly likely to be as corrupt or as ignorant as they would have their hearers suppose.

From my earliest days, I was brought up at St. Barnabas', Pimlico—one of the churches most intimately associated with the growth of High Church views in London. It was opened in 1850, and among those who preached on the occasion was the late Cardinal, then Archdeacon, Manning. In 1851 the Protestant feeling of a certain section of the community was roused. The riots which from time to time have disgraced the Protestant party,—which, nevertheless claims toleration as one of its virtues—and which culminated some years later in the scandalous scenes at St. George's in the East, broke out here. The timid Bishop of London closed the church and caused the resignation of Mr. Bennett, who received the living of Frome Selwood, Somerset, where he died some few years since, deeply regretted by his flock, whom he had familiarized with almost every Catholic doctrine and practice. It is worth noting, as showing the marvellous stride which Ritualism has made in the last forty years, that at St. Barnabas's the only then unusual ornaments were a plain cross and two candles on the so-called altar; an oak screen before the chancel, surmounted by a cross; a surpliced choir; and a service modelled on that of the English cathedrals.* No vestments save the ordinary surplice and black stole; no incense; no banners; no prayers save those in the Book of Common Prayer. The ornaments of the church which, forty years ago, had to be closed to protect it from the mob, would now hardly excite the notice of the Church Association.

My own memory dates, I suppose, from somewhere about 1856. The two great waves of conversion to the

* There was, indeed, a stone altar, which was subsequently removed, but this being covered was not conspicuously different from an ordinary table.

Catholic Church which followed the secession of Newman in 1845, and Manning in 1851, had passed: and in spite of occasional Protestant outbursts, the efforts of Protestant lecturers, and the adverse judgments of Privy Councils and other bodies, the High Church movement was steadily and everywhere gaining ground.

I will as briefly as possible tell you what I was taught to believe. First, I was taught that our Lord founded a Church, which He had built upon the foundation of His Apostles, He Himself being the chief corner-stone: that He had conferred on His Apostles certain powers by which they were enabled to carry on His work: that the Apostles had the power of forgiving sin, of consecrating the Eucharist, and of transmitting to their successors the supernatural power which they had themselves received: that the Apostles and those whom they consecrated were the rulers of the Christian Church: that this Church had power to define what was to be believed, and that it could not err, because of the promise of Christ that He would be with it, even to the end of the world: that the Church, moreover, was divinely guided in a very special manner by the Holy Ghost, and that its definitions to the end of time were inspired by the Holy Ghost, of Whom Christ had said "When He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He shall lead you into all truth:" that the Church and not the Bible was God's appointed teacher; that the traditions of the Church were of equal authority with the Bible; and that the Church was its only authorized interpreter.

I was further taught that the grace of God was conveyed to the soul principally by means of the Sacraments, and that by Baptism the stain of original sin was removed. With regard to the Real Presence of our Lord in the Holy Communion, I can best explain the teaching that I received by saying that when I became a Catholic, I was never conscious of any change of belief. The books which I used as an Anglican I could use equally well as a Catholic; they were compiled almost exclusively from Catholic sources, and before I had ever entered a Catholic church or read a Catholic book, I was familiar with the wonderful Eucharistic hymns of St. Thomas, and the other doctrinal hymns, modern as well as ancient, of the Catholic Church.

I do not think that in those days we were taught, as Anglicans are taught now, that there were seven Sacraments: but the practical result was the same. I shall never forget the care with which I was prepared for Confirmation; it never occurred to me to doubt that the clergy had the power of forgiving sins; indeed, I think I exaggerated this power, for I thought that the declaration of absolution at matins and evensong was sacramental. Confession was not urged as it is now, and confessionals were not, as they are now, openly placed in the churches; but in sermons and in private instruction the "benefit of absolution," as the Prayer-book calls it, was referred to, and we knew that confessions were heard in the sacristy. I have already said that we believed in the apostolical succession—in other words, in the sacrament of orders; and it was difficult to ignore the plain command of St. James as to Extreme Unction—indeed, I have never been able to understand, save on the basis of Luther's well-known saying that the Epistle of James was a "matter of straw," how Protestants evade compliance with this text.

As to externals, although in those days these had developed but little, the principle of them was laid down. We were told—and I do not see how any one can deny it—that there were two rituals authorized by Almighty God—the ancient Jewish rite, and the mystical vision of the Apocalypse. In both were found the symbolic use of vestments and incense, music and ceremonial: nowhere did we find any indication that these externals were to be done away, and we knew that the Christian Church adopted them from as early a period as was possible. The English Church, indeed, was shorn of her splendour, but the time would come when she would arise and put on her beautiful garments; and if there should be any High Churchman among my hearers, he will say, and say truly, that that time *has* come, and that, so far as externals go, the Established Church can now vie successfully with the Roman ritual in splendour and dignity.

And as with other externals, so with music. Among the many things for which I am grateful to those who brought me up, few are more present to me than the

love which they gave me for the old plain chant of the Church—the chant which we called Gregorian, thereby giving honour to the great Pope who sent St. Augustine to bring this nation back to God. And with the old chants we had the old words—not only the Psalms of David, but the words of the Fathers of the Church in her hymns—of St. Ambrose, and St. Gregory, and St. Bede, and St. Thomas Aquinas : for in those early days not a hymn was sung in that church which had not upon it the hall-mark of antiquity.

To the same hand which translated most of these hymns into sonorous and manly English, I owed my knowledge of the lives of the Saints, as portrayed in the volumes setting forth the ‘Triumphs of the Cross’ and the ‘Followers of the Lord.’ To Dr. Neale—that great liturgical scholar—I shall always feel a debt of gratitude for having made me understand, however imperfectly, what is meant by the Communion of Saints, and for having brought to my knowledge that wonderful storehouse of saintly history which is among the many treasures of the Catholic Church. It is true that we did not then, as Anglicans do now, invoke them, or address our litanies to the Mother of God ; yet the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints was inculcated upon us in many ways.

So with the observance, not only of festivals, - but of fasts—the duty of keeping both was impressed on us. The brightness of the sanctuary, with its many lights and flowers, and the stately procession, chanting psalms, was associated with all the great Christian festivals, making “the beauty of holiness,” something more than a name ; while the times of self-denial and the penitential season of Lent were brought home to us by the silent organ and the violet-hung sanctuary. The duty of supporting our pastors, the equality of all men before God,

“Who has but one same death for a hind,
And one same death for a king”

were also taught us, as fully as the Church herself teaches them.

You may wonder what were the impressions I received

with regard to the Catholic Church on one side, and Nonconformists on the other. With regard to the Church, I was taught that there were three branches—the Anglican, the Greek, and the Roman—and that of these three the Catholic Church was made up: that in this country the Church of England represented the Catholic Church, and that the Roman branch had no business here—yet, I am thankful to say, that I cannot remember ever having heard at St. Barnabas', a single sermon against Roman Catholics, or an uncharitable word regarding them. I therefore had none of those prejudices which seem inseparable from certain forms of Protestantism—prejudices which prevent even a fair hearing of the Catholic position. I remember one sermon on the honour due to the Blessed Virgin, in which the Roman devotion to her was spoken of as excessive; and another on St. Peter, in which his primacy, as distinct from his supremacy, was acknowledged: but until I was seventeen I never heard the Protestant side of the Church of England advanced from the pulpit, although then, as now, the itinerant Protestant lecturer presented to those who were credulous enough to accept his statements a caricature of the Catholic Church. In those days a Mr. Edward Harper, who had some prominent position in the Orange Society, occupied the place which is now held by Mr. Collette, and, was filled, until lately, by Mr. Mark Knowles.

I ought to add that I had never attended a Roman Catholic service, and had only once entered a Catholic church. This was the old Oratory, into which I went one winter afternoon on my way to the South Kensington Museum. One of the few things I knew about what I considered the Roman branch of the Church was that the Blessed Sacrament was reserved on its altars, and I remember kneeling in the dark, flat-roofed Oratory, with its lamp burning before the altar, in adoration of the Presence which I felt to be there. I was quite sure—for I had never heard it called in question—that the views I have given were those of the Church of England: that the Reformation, disastrous as it was, in many ways, had not broken the apostolical succession: and that the

Western and Eastern Churches, equally with the Anglican, had Orders and Sacraments, and were of the unity of the Faith.

With Nonconformists it was different. They had no authorized ministry, and therefore no sacraments. They had thrown off the authority of the Church, and substituted their own interpretation of the Bible. They were the followers of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; against them was directed the warning, "mark those who cause divisions among you, and avoid them." I am afraid that we looked upon them as socially inferior to ourselves—certainly as people to be avoided—and as "Protestants," a term which even then Anglicans held in contempt. With Catholics we had much in common—indeed, we *were* Catholics ourselves: but dissent, with its numberless divisions, absence of dignity, unauthorized teachers, and ugly conventicles—this was far from us, and with it we could hold no communion.

This was my position until, at about the age of eighteen, I went into the country to study medicine. I shall never forget my first Sunday there. There was a magnificent old parish church, with deep chancel and broad aisles, choked up with pews of the most obstructive design. A small table with a shabby red cloth stood away under the east window; a preached service, and a choir of a handful of men and boys, unsurpriced and untidy, sang the slender allowance of music; a parish clerk responded for the congregation;—these were the objects that met my eyes and ears that first Sunday of my exile. But that was not all. We had a sermon, delivered by a preacher in a black gown—to me a new and hideous vestment—on behalf of the Sunday schools. That sermon I shall always remember. In the course of it, the preacher enumerated the things they did *not* teach the children in the schools: they did *not* teach them they were born again in baptism, they did *not* teach that the clergy were descended from the Apostles, they did *not* teach that they had power to forgive sins, they did *not* teach a real presence in the Communion—"Real *presence*!" I heard a parson say in that church; "*I* believe in a real *absence*!"—they did *not* teach the doctrine of good works. I began to wonder what was

left to be taught, until the preacher explained that predestination and salvation by faith alone were inculcated upon the children. On the next Sunday the Holy Communion was administered—*how*, I can hardly describe, except by saying that it was manifest that no belief in its supernatural aspect was maintained. I can see now the parish clerk, at the end of the service, walking up the chancel, and the minister coming towards him with the paten in one hand and the chalice in the other, waiting while he, standing, ate and drank the contents of each.

My first feeling was that these clergy had no right or place in the Church of England. There was a moderately "high" church five miles off, and whenever I could, I found my way there. But it became unpleasantly plain that the Church of England, which I had regarded as an infallible guide, spoke with two voices:—I began to realize that even on vital matters two diametrically opposed opinions, not only *could be*, but *were*, held and preached. I knew my Book of Common Prayer, and its rubrics, as well as I knew my Bible: but to one part of it my attention had never been called, as it now was Sunday by Sunday. I had known without realizing all that it implied, that the Queen was, in some way, the Head of the Church—or rather, of two Churches, one in England and one in Scotland: but I now found that she declared herself to be "Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and, by God's ordinance, Defender of the Faith:" that General Councils, which I had been taught to believe infallible, could not be held "without the commandment and will of princes," and not only might err, but had erred, in things pertaining to God; that Confirmation, Penance, and the like, were not Sacraments of the Gospel; that the benefits of Baptism were confined to "they that receive it rightly;" that the reception of the body of Christ in the Holy Communion is dependent on the faith of the recipient; and that "the sacrifices of Masses . . . were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." This last was indeed a trial to me. It is true that twenty-five years ago the word "Mass" was not in common use among Anglicans as it is now, and

I do not think an Anglican clergyman would have been found to say in public, as one said the other day, that "he would not stay a minute in a Church where the Mass was not, for if they had not got the Mass, they had no worship whatever." But we knew that the term was retained in the first reformed Prayer-book, and that it was the name employed throughout the Western Church for the Eucharistic service.

Here then was my difficulty: and the more I faced it, the more I found that the ground which I had thought so sure was slipping away from under me. Not, thank God, that I ever doubted any of the truths which had been implanted in me: but I began to see, more and more clearly, that the authority on which I had thought them to rest was altogether lacking. I found that what I had received as the teaching of a Church was only the teaching of a certain section of its clergy; and that other clergy, with exactly as much authority, taught exactly opposite opinions: they were not priests, they said: they claimed to offer no sacrifice; no office of forgiving sin was theirs: they possessed no supernatural powers.

This was bad enough, but there was worse behind. The other branches of the Church—what did they say on these momentous points? Alas! there was no room for doubt here. Neither the Eastern nor Western "branches," each of them far larger than the Anglican, would admit for a moment the claims of the Anglican clergy to be priests: and a large section of themselves equally denied it. The Bishops in some cases expressly told the candidates for ordination that they were not made priests; and if there were no priests, how could the sacraments, depending on them, be celebrated? It was no special ill-will to Anglicans that Rome showed by refusing to recognize their orders; for she never denied those of the Greeks, although these were equally separated from her unity. The Branch Theory broke down—it would not work.

Then I read other books—many of them by Newman, for whom Anglicans in those days cherished a warm affection and respect, in spite of his secession. And more and more the conviction was forced upon me

that the beliefs in which I had been brought up I had received on the authority of certain individual members of a body which not only tolerated, but taught with equal authority, the exact opposite of these beliefs—that the Anglican communion, even as represented by those who claimed for it Catholicity, was a mere Protestant sect—differing only from more recent denominations in that it retained certain shreds and patches of the old faith. It was, in short, a compromise—a *via media* between Rome and Dissent—and it was as unsatisfactory as compromises usually are.

Meanwhile, there came upon me more and more plainly the claims of a Church which taught with authority and uniformity all that I believed; which claimed to be the one body having a right to teach; and which, without equivocation or hesitation, pointed out to its members one only means of salvation. By one of those occurrences which we call accidents I became acquainted with a Catholic priest—one of the first of those Anglicans who gave up friends and position and everything that could make life happy at the call of their Master. From him I learnt what was hitherto lacking to my knowledge of the Church; I realized, as I had never done before, that the first mark of God's Church was Unity—a mark which no one can pretend to find in the Church of England: and, after a period of anxiety such as none can know who have not experienced it, I was received into that Unity.

Of my experience since, you will not expect me to speak. If I must say anything, I will venture to employ the words of Cardinal Newman, which express better than any words of mine could, my feelings now:—“From the day I became a Catholic to this day, I have never had a moment's misgiving that the Communion of Rome is the Church which the Apostles set up at Pentecost, which alone has ‘the adoption of sons, and the glory, and the covenants, and the revealed law, and the service of God, and the promises,’ and in which the Anglican Communion, whatever its merits and demerits, whatever the great excellence of individuals in it, has, as such, no part. Nor have I ever for a moment hesitated in my conviction that it was my duty to join the

Catholic Church, which in my own conscience I felt to be Divine."

When I told my friends with whom I was living that I had become a Catholic, the result somewhat astonished me: and those good Protestants who assume—as many do—that persecution and Popery are inseparably connected, while Protestantism and liberty of conscience are convertible terms, may like to know what happened. My desk was broken open; my private letters were stolen; letters sent me through the post were intercepted, opened, and sometimes detained; I was prevented from going to a Catholic church or to see a Catholic priest; and a picture of the Crucifixion, which I had had in my room for years, was profaned in a way which I do not care to characterize. These things are small and trifling, compared with what many have suffered, but what light do not even they throw upon that right of private judgment which Protestants profess to hold so dear?

One thing seemed to me at my conversion remarkable, and still remains to me one of the most wonderful features of Protestantism—the universal assumption that Catholics do not know what they themselves believe, and that Protestants understand it far better. The average Protestant, for instance, thinks and often asserts that we believe that the Pope cannot sin, that we worship images, that we are disloyal to the Queen, that we put Our Lady in the place of God, that we sell absolution for money and have a recognized tariff for the remission of sins, that we may not read the Bible, that we would burn every Protestant if we could, that we lie habitually, that our convents are haunts of vice, that our priests are knaves or conscious impostors, and that our laity are dupes or fools. I could, if time would allow, easily bring extracts from Protestant writers in support of each of these positions. Not only so, but by isolated texts of scripture; by scraps of the Fathers, torn from their context, and often mistranslated; by misrepresentations of history; * by fragments of

* See *Mr. Collette as a Historian*, by the Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J.—Catholic Truth Society, 1d.

prayers and hymns, interpreted as no Catholic would interpret them; by erroneous explanations of what they see in our churches; by baseless inferences arising from ignorance of the very language we use—they formulate and are not ashamed to propagate charges against us which in many cases we cannot condemn seriously, because it is impossible to help laughing at them. Our contradictions are not listened to; our corrections are unheeded; our statements are disbelieved. Give us, we say, at least fair-play; hear what we have to say for ourselves; do not condemn us unheard; do not assume that we are all fools or rogues. But we are not listened to: we are not allowed to know what we ourselves believe! “O for the rarity of Christian charity,” or at any rate of Protestant charity. We are sometimes accused of omitting one of the commandments: but it is the bigoted Protestant who does this—he entirely forgets that there is in the Decalogue one which says sternly—“Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.” How many Protestants who speak against the Church have ever expended a penny on a Catechism which contains a full clear statement of Christian Doctrine—which is approved by authority, and on which the religious education of our children is based? Yet they would learn more from it of what we really believe than from a copy of every tract in Mr. Kensit’s shop, and of all the books which Mr. Collette ever wrote.

It often puzzles me how it is that Protestants do not realize the utter futility of the attempts they have been making for the last fifty years to arrest the tide of Catholic tendency which is flooding the nation. Go into St. Paul’s—say on the festival of the Gregorian Association—see the long procession of surpliced choirs with their banners, many of them bearing Catholic devices; listen to the old antiphons, unauthorized indeed by the Book of Common Prayer, set to the chants to which they are sung in the Church throughout the world wherever the Divine Office is chanted; see the preacher mount the pulpit, prefacing his sermon with the invocation of the Blessed Trinity and the sign of the Cross; hear him refer, as one referred two years since, to “Our Lady”—a

title only less dear to Catholics than that of Our Lord : and as you sit and listen, look to the end of the church, with its dignified and decorated altar, and the gorgeous reredos, not unworthy of a Catholic church, with the great Crucifix in its centre, and over all the statue of Mary with her Divine Child in her arms : and as you leave the church, do not forget to notice the side chapel and its handsome altar, with cross, and flowers, and lights, where the daily communion service is held. Then remember that less than forty years since, not one of these ornaments or signs could be seen in the desolate dirty edifice, with its shabby communion-table well-nigh out of sight under the east window. Go to Westminster, and see, prominent at the restored north door, another statue of Mary with her Child. Go up and down the country, both to your large towns and to your remote villages, and you will find the same advance—only more developed. Last year, I strolled into the magnificent old abbey church of a little Oxfordshire village : the air was dim and heavy with incense ; there were three altars, each with lights and crucifix and sacring-bell complete ; on the notice board was a copy of the parish magazine, in which I read an exhortation on the duty of hearing Mass on Sunday which might have been taken—and it may be was taken—from a Catholic manual of instruction : and a list of the services to be held on the Feast of Corpus Christi ! The Crucifix is now common in Protestant churches ; pictures of Our Lady are not rare ; statues of her are to be found—why do not our Protestant friends look to this, instead of raising their voices against Catholicism ? They shriek and rant after their manner ; yet one stronghold after another is captured, and they stand by and are powerless to hinder it.

Look at the wealth of literature of every kind, which pours forth from the ritualistic press : the manuals and treatises, the dogmatic works, the numberless little books, each more advanced than the last, with which the country is literally flooded, and of which the St. Agatha's Sunday Scholars' Book, which lately received a notice from the Protestant Alliance, is but one out of a thousand. Look even at the levelling up which has marked the publications of so eminently respectable a body as the Society

for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. How is it that, with all your power and influence and money, you cannot arrest this advance in the direction of Rome?

And what about Rome itself? There are those who think that England is rapidly becoming Catholic. I am not of that number: but I cannot fail to see that the fields are white unto harvest: and I see too that the labourers are being sent forth into the harvest.

More than fifty years ago, Macaulay pointed out in that wonderful essay on Ranke's History of the Popes, which I would commend to all Protestants who do not know it, as a "most remarkable fact, that no Christian nation, which did not adopt the principles of the Reformation before the end of the 16th century, should ever have adopted them. Catholic communities have since that time become infidel and become Catholic again; but none has become Protestant." How is it at home? Protestants have poured money into Ireland; they did not scruple to avail themselves, to their everlasting disgrace, of the sufferings of the great famine in order to buy over with their funds the souls and bodies of the destitute Irish. "God has opened a great door to us in Ireland"—such was the blasphemous announcement which prefaced one of the appeals for those liberal funds without which no Protestant missionary enterprise, at home or abroad, can be carried on. What is the result? Is Ireland less Catholic than she was? Come closer—come to England—here are facts which Protestants will not dispute, for they come to you with the authority of the Protestant Alliance, from one of whose publications I quote them. Since 1851, the number of priests in England has more than trebled itself; of churches, chapels, and stations, we have now 1387, where in 1851 we had 586; of religious houses of men we have 220, against 17, forty years ago; of convents—those favourite objects of attack to a certain class of Protestants—those places whose inmates, to judge from the rubbish one hears and reads, have only one aim—to escape—we have just 9 times as many as we had in 1851: the numbers are 450 and 53. Come nearer home: in 1851 the diocese of Southwark included what is now the diocese of Portsmouth: there were then in it 67 priests; there are now, in the two

dioceses, 428—an increase of 363; there were 57 churches and stations, where there are now exactly 200; there are 80 convents instead of 9; there are 38 monasteries instead of 1! Come to these very doors; when I came to live in Southwark, eight years ago, there was for this vast district one church—the Cathedral, with four priests; now the staff at the Cathedral is more than doubled, and Walworth, the Borough, and Vauxhall are separated into distinct missions, each with two priests. Add to this such churches as St. Alphege and St. Agnes, where the doctrines taught, and the ornaments used, are almost identical with our own; All Saints (Lambeth), St. John the Divine, Christ Church (Clapham), and many more, where sacramental teaching of an advanced type is given; and then calculate for yourselves what effect in this neighbourhood the puny and impotent attacks of the Protestant Alliance is likely to produce: a Society whose patron should surely be the good old lady who thought to sweep back the sea with a mop; whose members spend their money on red rags, and waste their time by shaking them in the face of a bull—I mean John Bull—who doesn't care twopence about them. My Protestant friends, there was one of old who gave sound advice to those who took counsel to slay Peter and they that were with him: “Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found to fight against God.” Remember that “in spite of dungeon, fire, and sword,”—in spite of the penal laws, which the Lord Chief Justice has lately styled “a code as hateful as anything ever seen since the foundation of the world”—the Faith is among you still; the gates of hell have not prevailed against it.

And—speaking quite soberly and dispassionately—I do not hesitate to say that some of the weapons which are employed against the Church seem to me to come from within those gates. I respect the conscientious, God-fearing Protestants who, under the influence of strong delusion, feel it their duty to oppose the Church. I remember the case of Saul, afterwards called Paul, and how he persecuted the Church of God; and I do not

despair of their conversion. I have only sympathy for those who are misled by prejudiced and bigoted teachers. Every convert can say, with the man in the Gospel, "whereas I was blind, now I see;" and I am not sure that those who have had the happiness of being born Catholics always make sufficient allowance for the imperfect vision of those without the fold. But what shall be said in defence of those who are not ashamed to write and to publish calumnies, as foul as they are false, against priests and nuns, and the Sacraments of the Church—those "lewd fellows of the baser sort," who, under the guise of religion, do not scruple to pander to the lowest and worst of passions by the circulation of filthy fictions of which 'Maria Monk' is by no means the worst—of works which, so far as I know, are to be found in only two places in London—in the shop of a Protestant publisher, and in a street which has for years obtained an evil notoriety for the sale of indecent literature. I am not going to name these books: but if any one is anxious, for any good purpose, to know to what I refer, I am ready to tell him. Some years since, one of the worst of these was seized and condemned as an indecent publication. Since then, the Protestant purveyors* of pornographic publications have been more careful to keep within the letter of the law, although it is not long since the editor of *Truth*—by no means a scrupulous purist—denounced some of their wares as outraging decency. These, and the highly spiced lectures "to men," or "to women *only*"—appeal to but one class of persons; and I call upon all decent men and women, be they Jew, Turk, heretic, or infidel—and above all, upon Mr. Collette, who was at one time intimately connected with a body called the Society for the Suppression of Vice—to dissociate themselves from any part in the wholesale propagation of indecency which is carried on in the name of religion. The cause must indeed be a bad and a hopeless one which can stoop to avail itself of weapons such as these.

But I will not refer further to a hateful kind of warfare with which very few will sympathise. I will

* See *Truth*, Dec. 28, 1893, for further remarks on one of these persons.

rather briefly apply to two among the many schools of thought in the Establishment the remarks which I have made.

To the Protestants or Low Churchmen I would say: Can you conscientiously remain in a Church, the members of which claim to hold all Roman doctrine, save that of submission to the Pope—which permits the teaching not only of Baptismal Regeneration and the Real Presence, but of Confession, the Monastic or Religious Life, the use of Images, Fasting, Prayers and Masses for the Dead, the Invocation of Saints, Prayers to the Blessed Virgin, the power of dispensing from religious obligations—and which not only allows these things to be taught, but permits them to be emphasized by every external adjunct? To the High Churchman my question is exactly the converse of this. You believe all or most of the points which I have just enumerated: can you remain in communion with those who deny them? Read, if you have not read it, a pamphlet on the Reformation by one of your own Bishops—Dr. Ryle—one of those whom you regard as successors of the Apostles, with the power of ordaining priests. He tells you how the reformers “stripped the office of the clergy of any sacerdotal character”—how they removed the words ‘sacrifice’ and ‘altar’ from the Prayer-book, and retained the word priest only in the sense of presbyter or elder—how they denied the power of the keys—how they cast out the sacrifice of the Mass as a blasphemous fable, took down the altars, prohibited images and crucifixes, and “declared that the sovereign had supreme authority and chief power in this realm in all causes ecclesiastical.” What is gained by the wearing of cope and mitre and the teaching of sacramental doctrine by one bishop, if another can at the same time, with equal authority, denounce all these things? and how can a Church, with any claim to be considered as teaching with authority, tolerate with equanimity both of these extremes?

We Catholics are so accustomed to the unity of the Church that we do not perhaps always think what a wonderful thing it is: and Protestants, I find, often do not realize it. They sometimes point to our religious

orders as if they were equivalent to their own manifold divisions! It is, I believe, the literal truth that as the sun shines day by day on each part of the world, he sees at each moment the Blessed Sacrifice of the Altar uplifted to the Eternal Father. Where, save in the Catholic Church, shall we find such a fulfilment of the prophecy—"from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same shall incense be offered to my name and a pure offering?" Not only so, but throughout the world—from "Greenland's icy mountains" to "India's coral strand"—wherever two or three are gathered together in the One Name is the same belief, the same sacrifice, mainly the same ritual: so that the Irish exile leaving the Old World for the New, where Catholicism is increasing with rapid strides, is as much at home in the churches of New York as he was in his roadside country chapel in the old country. Can any Catholic for a moment conceive the possibility of finding any one doctrine preached at St. George's contradicted by the priest at Walworth, controverted in the sermons in the Catholic chapel at Vauxhall, and called in question by Canon Murnane in the Borough? Can he imagine Cardinal Vaughan's teaching on the Mass contradicted by our own beloved Bishop? But will any Protestant tell me that—to take the two Anglican churches nearest to us—the teaching at St. Paul's is identical with that at St. Alphege? Could Mr. Allwork's congregation next Sunday avail themselves of Mr. Goulden's ministrations, or join in the hymns and prayers addressed to the Blessed Sacrament and the Mother of God?

The Catholic can go all over the world, and wherever he goes he will find the same Faith and the same Sacrifice. The Protestant cannot go at random into two churches in the same neighbourhood with any certainty that the teaching or ceremonial will be similar, and that with regard to the most vital points of faith. "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" Remember that, as the cowl does not make the monk, so the most elaborate ritual and the most advanced teaching cannot make a Catholic. A few weeks ago I strolled into a handsome church in this neighbourhood, just as a lady dressed like a nun was taking the school-children to service. There was the raised altar, with its flowers

and lights and crucifix and what looked very like a tabernacle, and before the altar burned seven lamps. "Is this a Catholic church?" I said to the verger. "No, sir, Church of England," was the reply. My friends, disguise it as you will, the truth will out: your Catholic church is only the Church of England after all.

One point more. When I was thinking of becoming a Catholic, I pointed out to a friend these differences existing in the Church of England. Both, I said, cannot be true: neither the Church herself, nor the State which supports her, is able to say with authority which is right. My friend told me—that I believe people still say—that High and Low Church were united in essentials. Surely the most ignorant and superstitious Papists ever invented by a Protestant lecturer would recoil before such an absurdity as this statement involves. Surely it is "essential" to know whether Baptism is a mere symbol or a regenerating Sacrament; it cannot be a matter of indifference whether the sons of men have or have not power on earth to forgive sins; it cannot be a matter of opinion whether the Sacrifice of the Mass is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit, or the renewal of the great Sacrifice offered on Calvary? There must be an authority to pronounce upon these points, and the Church of England neither has nor claims to be such authority. From the time of the Gorham Judgment, which left Baptism an open question, down to the Archbishop of Canterbury's decision the other day, uncertainty, vagueness, and indecision have marked every attempt to formulate any definite opinion. This last attempt has indeed justified ritualism on the ground that it means nothing in particular, and above all, nothing Roman. No wonder the *Times* spoke of a "sense of unreality," in "the effort to treat, as neutral or colourless, acts which we all know to be, in the view of a party in the Church, technical symbols and unequivocal doctrinal signs." It is true that, with marvellous effrontery a popular Anglican hymn asserts—

"We are not divided,
All one body we;
One in hope and doctrine,
One in charity."

But does any Anglican believe it to be true? "Not divided!" Is there any one who will assert that the "doctrine" preached in the first half-dozen Anglican churches he comes across will be "one?"—or that the teaching of what is termed, with unconscious irony, the "religious press," has any claims to be considered identical? If the "doctrine" is one, why do we find in the same Church two such organizations as the English Church Union and the Church Association, each diametrically opposed to the other, and the latter continually prosecuting the clergy who represent the views of the former? Is there anywhere such a spectacle of division as this—a division which, as soon as the bonds of State Establishment shall have been broken asunder, cannot fail to be even more manifest than it is at present.

"Not divided!" It must be nearly thirty years ago, I think, that St. Paul's, Lorrimore Square, was in the forefront of Anglicanism. There was a change of vicar, and the congregation so little realized that they were "one in doctrine" with their new clergyman, that a great part of them seceded, and formed the nucleus of what is now the large body of worshippers attending St. Agnes', Kennington. But why, if they were "not divided," if they were "one in doctrine," did they not stay where they were?

"Not divided!" Is not division the very essence of Protestantism? and are not the divisions in the Establishment sufficient proof that it is Protestant? "We have within the Church of England," said the *Times* on one occasion, "persons differing not only in their particular tenets, but in the rule and ground of their belief."

Put it another way. Take the case of a Nonconformist who desires to become a member of the Church of England: suppose him to be some one in this neighbourhood: is he to be taken to St. Paul's or to St. Alphège's? Who is to decide? Surely it is not a matter of indifference. Mr. Ruskin has said that "The Protestant who most imagines himself independent in his thought, and private in his study of Scripture, is nevertheless usually at the mercy of the nearest preacher who has a pleasant voice and ingenious fancy."* And

surely the faith which is put forward as that of the Church of England, depends entirely on the belief of the individual parson referred to. How different is the case with the Catholic Church!

I have said that the Church of England neither has nor claims authority; and my last words shall be devoted to making this plain. If she has authority, as our High Church friends assert, whence does she derive it? Not from the old Church of England, for by the Reformation of Elizabeth, the old Catholic episcopate was swept away. Of the sixteen surviving Catholic Bishops, all save one—Kitchen of Llandaff, who took no part in the Reformation, nor in the consecration of Parker—were imprisoned, and Parker and those consecrated by him were intruded into the sees of the imprisoned Bishops. But granting that Parker and the rest were validly consecrated, whence did they get jurisdiction? Certainly not from the old Catholic Bishops; most certainly not from the source whence these obtained it, namely, the Pope; not by the fact of consecration, for orders and jurisdiction are distinct, and received independently of each other; not from either of Parker's consecrators—Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins—for not one of these was in possession of a see, and they could not give what they themselves did not possess. The only answer possible, however unpalatable it may be to High Churchmen, is, that they got jurisdiction from the Crown, or not at all.

Every Protestant bishop now takes the oath of supremacy, by which he professes that the Sovereign is the "only supreme governor" of the realm "in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal." Whence the Sovereign obtained this supremacy, or what "warranty of Scripture" can be adduced for it, I do not know; nor do I think it is easy to ascertain.

Moreover, the Establishment not only does not possess authority, but she expressly disclaims it. The First General Council of the Church prefaced its teaching with—"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us:" and the Catholic Church, right down to the present day, has spoken with like authority. But what does the Church of England say? Her anxiety not to

be regarded as having any authority is almost pathetic : All Churches have erred, she says, in matters of faith and (by implication) I may fail also. The Church has power, indeed, to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, but it cannot decree anything unless it is taken out of Holy Scripture. General Councils are not only dependent on the will of princes, but, when assembled, may err and have erred : nor may the Church declare anything of faith which is not read in Holy Scripture. To go a step further, who gave Holy Scripture its authority ? It claims none for itself as a whole ; it nowhere tell us of what books it is composed ; Christians are nowhere told to read it ; no text bids us keep Sunday holy, or authorizes infant baptism, or the taking of oaths. Who vouches for the authority of the Bible, I repeat ? who, but that Church which from the earliest times has been its guardian and its only rightful interpreter.

It is true that to claim authority is one thing, and to possess it another. If saying we had a thing were equivalent to having it, we should find now-a-days authorized teachers in abundance. But it is difficult to believe that a body deriving its teaching power from God would take so much trouble to deny the possession of it. The Catholic Church does not act thus.

And when the spiritual head of the Establishment is consulted, he shows himself her true son. Some years ago, Mr. Maskell, who afterwards became a Catholic, asked the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Sumner, whether he might or might not teach certain doctrines of faith ? "To which," the Archbishop said, "I reply : Are they contained in the word of God ? Whether they are so contained, and can be proved thereby, you have the same means of discovering as myself, and I have no special authority to declare."

Here is the judgment passed upon the Church of England by the learned Dr. Döllinger, a man who has some claim to respect from Protestants, seeing that he had the misfortune to die outside the unity of the Catholic Church. "There is no church that is so completely and thoroughly as the Anglican, the product and expression of the wants and wishes, the modes of thought

and cast of character, not of a certain nationality, but of a fragment of a nation, namely, the rich, fashionable, and cultivated classes. It is the religion of deportment, of gentility, of clerical reserve. Religion and the Church are then required to be above all things, not troublesome, not intrusive, not presuming, not importunate." "It is a good church to live in," some one once said, "but a bad one to die in."

The absence of authority and of definite teaching—these were the reasons which induced me to leave the Church of England. The step once taken, all was clear; and on every side I found abundant evidence that, if there be a Church of God upon earth, the Holy Catholic and Roman Church alone can claim that title. That evidence I cannot bring before you now—I have already detained you too long. My Catholic hearers do not need it, and my Protestant friends will do well to seek it from those better qualified than myself, qualified to speak with an authority which cannot attach to any sayings of mine. To both Catholics and Protestants I would recommend the perusal of those lectures which were delivered by John Henry Newman, "the noblest Roman of them all"—not long after he left the Establishment, thus, as Lord Beaconsfield said upon one occasion, "dealing the Church of England a blow from which she still reels." In those lectures you will find almost every popular objection against the Church met with a charm of literary style and with a courtesousness of expression which, so far as I know, has never been equalled; and even those who remain unconvinced of the truth of the Church will be constrained to admit that there is at least another aspect of things which seemed to them to admit of only one, and that a bad one. It has been well said that the truths of the Church are like stained glass windows in a building: look at them from without, all is confusion; but go inside, let the light of heaven stream through them, and each colour takes its place in the glorious and beautiful picture which is presented to your delighted gaze. So from without, the doctrines of the Church seem dark and confused; but the light from heaven pours through them to those within.



Before and After the Reformation.

A Contrast.

By J. H. M.

THOSE who are not very old can remember the time when it was the boast of the members of the Established Church that their Church had at the Reformation separated itself from the Church which existed in England before the Reformation. Theirs was a Protestant Church; the Church before the Reformation was Popish; Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley were saints, who had laid down their lives to free their country from gross errors and superstitions; the "invocation of saints" was with them a "fond thing vainly invented;" "the sacrifices of masses" were "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits;" and it was their firm belief that "by the space of eight hundred years and more" (before the Reformation) "laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think)" were "drowned in abominable idolatry," as the *Homily against Peril of Idolatry* teaches. Of course, to people holding these views it never occurred that, as regards essentials, their Church and the Church before the Reformation were identical.

But since those days a great change has taken place. New views have come into fashion, the Tractarian and Ritualistic movements having led to a revival of many Catholic doctrines and practices. In "High" Churches,

doctrines are now taught, and ceremonies are now in use, which would have shocked Anglicans of any generation from the Reformation to nearly the middle of the present century; and, as this revival does not accord with old fashioned Protestant notions, a new theory has been started in defence of the Established Church, and that is, that in essentials it is identical with the Church before the Reformation; that it is merely a continuation of that Church. This new theory is now being continually reiterated on all sides, and we are told that, if only we study history, we shall be convinced of the truth of it. To history then let us go, and see what it has to say about several of these essentials. In this enquiry it will not be necessary for us to go so far back as the British Church, for what we want to know is whether, as regards the essentials we are going to consider, there is any real identity between the Church of the English people before the Reformation and the Established Church afterwards.

The Headship of the Church.

Let us begin with the Headship of the Church. Whatever may be said to the contrary, it is quite evident that the English people, from the time of their conversion to Christianity down to the reign of Henry VIII, acknowledged the Pope to be the Head of the Church, and never doubted that he had jurisdiction within this realm. As we all know, at the end of the 6th century the English had conquered and taken possession of the country that we now call England, and English neathenism had taken the place of British Christianity, except in some remote parts: and the first who came to convert these heathen English to Christianity was St. Augustine, a Roman Abbot, who with a band of monks landed in Kent in 597. St. Augustine was sent by a Pope, Pope Gregory, and on his mission proving successful, he was appointed, by the same Pope, Archbishop of the English nation, and received from him the pallium, the badge of authority worn by Archbishops. Much has been said lately of the partial failure of St. Augustine's Mission, and of the share that the Irish missionaries Aidan,

Cedd, Ceadda, and their followers had in the conversion of the English, as a proof of the independence of the Church of England, its independence as regards Rome. It is indeed true that these holy and zealous missionaries did much towards the conversion of this country, and we owe them a great debt of gratitude, and it is also true that on certain points they differed from the Roman missionaries: but their differences were on matters of discipline only, such as the fashion of the tonsure, and the time of keeping Easter; and Mr. Green, a Protestant historian, in his *Making of England*, tells us that immediately after the Synod of Whitby in 664, which was summoned for the settlement of these differences, "from the Channel to the Firth of Forth the English Church was now a single religious body within the obedience of Rome, and the time had come for carrying out those plans of organization which Rome had conceived from the first moment of Augustine's landing."* He goes on to describe how those plans were carried out. He tells us that, on the death of Deusdedit Archbishop of Canterbury, Oswy king of Northumbria and Egbert King of Kent selected Wighard for the post of Primate of all England, and sent him for consecration to Rome. Wighard, however, died on his arrival in Rome, and on his death Pope Vitalian fixed on Theodore, an Eastern monk, and sent him to England, and "he came," says Mr. Green, "with a clear and distinct aim—the organization of the English dioceses, the grouping of these subordinate centres round the see of Canterbury, and the bringing the Church which was thus organized into a fixed relation to western Christendom through its obedience to the see of Rome. With this purpose he spent the three years which followed his arrival, from 669 to 672, in journeying through the whole island. Wherever he went he secured obedience to Rome by enforcing the Roman observance of Easter and the other Roman rites, while his very presence brought about for himself a recognition of his primacy over the nation at large. As yet no Archbishop had crossed the bounds

* p. 325.

of Kent, and to the rest of Britain the primate at Canterbury must have seemed a mere provincial prelate like the rest. But the presence of Theodore in Northumbria, in Mercia, in Wessex alike, the welcome he everywhere received, the reverence with which he was everywhere listened to, at once raised his position into a national one. 'He,' says Bæda, 'was the first of the Archbishops whom the whole English Church consented to obey.'"*

In 735 too, we find Egbert, who occupied the see of York, procuring from Rome "his recognition as Archbishop:" and Offa King of Mercia, wishing an Archbishopric to be founded in his Kingdom, sought the permission of the Pope, Adrian I. "The mission of two Papal legates to Britain in 786 was the result of urgent letters from the King; and in a synod, held under their presidency in the following year, Lichfield was raised into an Archbishopric with the Bishops of Mercia and East Anglia for its suffragans."† And in 803, for certain reasons, Lichfield was reduced by Pope Leo III. to a Bishopric. In a Saxon bidding prayer, which Canon Simmons quotes in his "Lay Folks' Mass Book," there are these words: "Let us pray for our Pope in Rome and for our King."‡ Thus it is evident that the Church of England in those early days was Roman Catholic, and acknowledged the Pope to be Head of the Church.

And, if we study the history of England, we shall find that from those days to the Reformation there was no change in this respect. We shall find that all the Archbishops of Canterbury, down to and including Cranmer, received the pallium, the badge of archiepiscopal authority, from Rome, and took the oath, promising allegiance to the Holy See; and that the spiritual authority of the Pope was always recognized by King and people. In a paper of this kind it would occupy too much space to give the many proofs that are to be met with in history with reference to this subject, from Anglo-Saxon times to the Reformation; and I will therefore only mention what has been said and done by those competent to form an opinion.

* p. 330.

† *Making of England*, p. 404 and 422.

‡ 63.

Henry VIII, in his *Defence of the Seven Sacraments against Luther*, says, that "Luther cannot deny that every orthodox Church acknowledges and venerates the most holy Roman See as Mother and Head." Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England*, speaking of an act passed, in the reign of Henry VIII, to take away all appeals to Rome from Ecclesiastical Courts, tells us that it "annihilated at one stroke the jurisdiction built on long usage and on the authority of the false decretals." * With regard to these false decretals, I may just remark that they were written about the middle of the 9th century, and therefore they could have had nothing to do with the Pope's jurisdiction in this country, which, as I have shown, was firmly established in the 7th century. Then we have the evidence, not in words only but in deeds, of Sir Thomas More and the Bishops deposed in the reign of Elizabeth. Sir Thomas More, who suffered martyrdom in defence of the Supremacy of the Pope, was, we know, a most learned man, an able lawyer, and well acquainted with the constitutional history of England; a reformer in the right sense of the word, and a thorough Englishman. Is it likely that such a man as this would have laid down his life at a time when he was in the enjoyment of everything that could make that life attractive, for a jurisdiction which was not built on long usage, and which it was the duty of Englishmen to get rid of? In the reign of Elizabeth, fifteen out of the sixteen Bishops refused the oath of Supremacy, and were deposed.

We thus see that the English people, from the 7th to the 16th century, acknowledged the Pope to be the Head of the Church. At the Reformation all this was changed. Henry the VIII. assumed the title of "protector and only supreme head of the Church and clergy of England;" and that this was no empty title, we may learn from Mr. Green's *History of the English People*. He tells us that "the Articles of Religion, which Convocation received and adopted without venturing on a protest, were drawn up by the hand of Henry himself. The

* p. 60.

Bible and the three creeds were laid down as the sole ground of faith. The sacraments were reduced from seven to three, only Penance being allowed to rank on an equality with Baptism and the Lord's supper."* And speaking of the new version of the Bible, then published, he says: "The story of the Supremacy was graven on its very title page. The new foundation of religious truth was to be regarded throughout England as a gift, not from the Church, but from the King. It is Henry on his throne who gives the sacred volume to Cranmer, ere Cranmer and Cromwell can distribute it to the throng of priests and laymen below."† And in the reign of Elizabeth when the new religion was fully established, all the beneficed clergy, and all laymen holding office under the crown, were obliged to take the following oath of supremacy: "I, A. B. do utterly testify and declare, that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm, and all other her Highness's dominion and countries, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal: and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm." Thus, by the tyrannical conduct of Henry and his daughter Elizabeth, the usage of nearly a thousand years was altered; and the result was that the English people were separated from the rest of Christendom, and their religion, which had been Catholic, became the religion of a race. We see then, that, as regards this essential, the Headship of the Church, the Established Church is not identical with the Church before the Reformation.

The Holy Eucharist.

Let us next take the Holy Eucharist, and see whether, as regards the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, there is any identity between the Church before the Reformation and the Established Church. In the Sarum, and other English Missals in use before the Reformation, we find the doctrine of the Real Presence

expressed in unmistakable language. For instance, in the Sarum Missal the Priest at his Communion is directed to say before receiving the Body (*corpus*), "Hail eternally, most holy flesh of Christ;" and before receiving the Blood (*sanguinem*), "Hail eternally heavenly drink." And in the rubric that follows the Priest's Communion, the direction is given that the sub-deacon "should pour into the chalice wine and water, and that the Priest should rinse his hands, lest any remains of the Body and Blood (*aliquæ reliquæ corporis vel sanguinis*) should remain on his fingers, or on the chalice." In the rubrics too that follow the Consecration, the consecrated elements are called the Body and Blood. Here we see plainly that the Body and Blood of Christ were believed to be present and that this Presence was regarded as being due to the words of Consecration alone, and not to the faith of the recipient. And if we study the history of pre-Reformation times with reference to the Blessed Sacrament, we shall find devotions and practices which express this same belief. In the *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, which was written in the 12th century, the laity are thus instructed:

"Loke pater noster thou be sayande,
 To tho chalyce he be saynande:
 Then tyme is nere of sakring,
 A litel belle men oyse to ryng.
 Then shal thou do reverence
 To ihesu crist awen presence,
 That may lese alle baleful bandes;
 Knelande holde vp both thi handes."*

We read that costly tabernacles, pyxes, and other receptacles were provided for the reservation of the Holy Eucharist. With regard to these, the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, in his *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, states that the Council of Lambeth, in 1281, orders that in every parish church there must be a decent tabernacle, with a lock. In this the Body of the Lord must be placed in a very beautiful pyx, and linen coverings. (*Wilkins* ii. 48.) That "in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in 1385,

there was a noble ivory pyx, garnished with silver plates, gilt, with a foot covered with leopards and precious stones, having a cover of silver gilt with a border of sapphires, and on the top of the cover a figure of the crucifix with Mary and John, garnished with pearls, with three chains meeting in a disk of silver gilt, with a long silver chain by which it hangs. (*Dugdale Mon.* viii. 1365.) That "small silver and copper pyxes were also common in villages, as in the parish of Heybridge near Malden in Essex, we find one of each kind. (Churchwarden's account. p. 175.)" And that "at the abbey of St. Alban's as we learn from Matthew Paris, Eadfrid, the fifth Abbot, in the time of King Edmund the Pious (A.D. 941-6) had purchased a most beautiful vessel, as admirable in workmanship as in material, and had offered it to St. Alban's to place in it the Body of our Lord." Then there were processions of the Blessed Sacrament on Palm Sunday and on the Feast of Corpus Christi round churches and churchyards, and through the streets of towns and villages, thronged with adoring worshippers.

And now let us contrast all this with the teaching and practices of the Established Church. Let us first take the Anglican "Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper." In the prayer of consecration we find these words: "Grant that, we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." Thus we see that what is to be received is bread and wine—consecrated it may be, but still bread and wine—and that not until partaken of are they to become the Body and Blood of Christ. This is in accordance with Article xxviii. "The Body of Christ," it says, "is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." And in the rubrics that follow the prayer of consecration we do not, in a single instance, find the words Body and Blood, as we do in the Sarum Missal. These are the expressions used. At the adminis-

tration: "When he" (the minister) "delivereth the Bread to anyone he shall say." "If the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent," &c. "What remaineth of the consecrated elements." And in the explanatory and apologetic rubric at the end of the Communion Service we are told that the communicants are required to receive the "Lord's Supper," kneeling, "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise insue." This rubric was evidently intended to exclude adoration of Christ, present in any manner under the outward appearance of bread and wine; for the kneeling, it tells us, was enjoined for quite another purpose.

In some Anglican churches the hymn:

"Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour, Thee,
Who in Thy Sacrament dost deign to be."

is sung during the Communion service. How incongruous are such words in connection with a service which has such a rubric attached to it!

Again, in the pre-Reformation Church the Blessed Sacrament was, as we have seen, reserved, carried about, lifted up, and Christ, therein present, was worshipped, but Article xxviii. expressly says: "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." And we know that at the Reformation all tabernacles and pyxes were removed from the churches, and the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament was no longer allowed. Since then the churches have been but as caskets from which the jewels have been stolen, and they have ceased to be the homes of the people, the daily resort of the grateful, the sorrowful, the needy, as they were when Christ Himself was there.

And now with regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In the Sarum Missal we find the following prayers: "Receive, O holy Trinity, this offering which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in Thy honour and that of the blessed Mary

and all Thy Saints, for my sins and offences, for the salvation of the living and the rest of all the faithful departed." "May our sacrifice be so offered in Thy sight, that it may be received by Thee this day." We also find that the priest is directed to turn to the people and say "Brothers and sisters, pray for me, that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to the Lord God." And in the Canon of the Mass the priest says: "We most humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thy altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty, that as many of us as by participation at this altar, receive the Most Sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace," and then he goes on to pray for the dead. It is well known that, in the pre-Reformation Church, it was the custom to offer the Mass for special intentions, whether for the living, or the dead, and that Chantries were founded and endowed for the express purpose of Masses being offered for the dead.

And now let us turn to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the "Book of Common Prayer." In Article xxxi. it is stated that "The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits"—*i.e.*, that such Masses, as had hitherto been offered in churches and chantry chapels, were "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits," and, accordingly, endowments for special Masses were confiscated, and chantries were done away with and from the service that was substituted for the Mass, and every expression that might keep alive the old belief with regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass was eliminated. For the word Mass, which conveyed the idea of both Sacrifice and Communion, we have the title, "The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," which was evidently intended to exclude all notion of Sacrifice. In the "Prayer for the Church Militant" the word "oblations" is used, but it is in connection with the word "alms." And in the prayer

after Communion there are the words "Our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and, "here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee"—which expressions certainly may be used, as they have been used by Protestants for three centuries, without any belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The word altar, which we find repeatedly used in the Sarum Missal, is not once to be met with in the Anglican Communion Service: it is always called the "Table," or "the Holy Table," or "Lord's Table," Catholic terms, but used with reference to Communion. A further proof of the intention of the reformers was the order to destroy the old stone altars, and to replace them by wooden tables; and tables, like those in ordinary use, were accordingly provided—an ingenious and effectual means of destroying all belief, not only in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but also in the Real Presence. The bread used for Communion was to "be such as is usual to be eaten;" and the tables, on which it was placed, were to be such as were found in their own houses, and on which their daily food was placed. As regards this essential, the Holy Eucharist, there is, we see, no real identity between the pre-Reformation Church and the Established Church. It is true, that in the teaching and practices of extreme High Churchmen this identity is to a certain extent to be found; but then we must remember that these men are but a modern sect in the Established Church, whose teaching and practices are regarded by their fellow Anglicans as being contrary to the principles of the Reformation, as undoubtedly they are. To know what the teaching of the Anglican Church is on this subject, we must not look to those, who, dissatisfied with the meagre teaching and practices of their Church, have adopted doctrines and practices in accordance with their own more Catholic views, but to the formularies of their Church and the practices that have prevailed in it from the 16th to the 19th century.

We have seen what the teaching of the formularies is; we have seen that everything that might keep alive a belief in

the Real Presence, or in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, was done away with at the Reformation and many of us know, from our own personal experience, how thoroughly the old belief with regard to the Holy Eucharist had died out in the Established Church. We know what was generally the state of affairs some few years ago—bread prepared for the Communion with but little care or reverence; crumbs of the consecrated bread scattered about the chancel floor; crumbs left on the paten, or plate; and consecrated wine left in the cup to be dealt with as clerk or sexton should think fit; the “Communion plate” given to the Rectory servant to be cleaned with the family plate; the absence of those marks of reverence common among Catholics; the quarterly, or monthly celebration of the Communion service; the nearly empty church, when that service was celebrated; the greater popularity of the “Morning” and “Evening prayer”—all quite incompatible with a belief in the Real Presence or Eucharistic Sacrifice. Certainly, owing to the influence of the High Church party, there has been an improvement in this respect; still the fact remains that these, and such as these, have been the practices and customs of Anglicans during almost the whole of the existence of the Established Church.

Invocation of Saints.

And now let us consider another essential, the Invocation of Saints. In the pre-Reformation Church the invocation of the Saints was generally practised. For instance, there were Litanies of the Saints which were used on different occasions. In the Visitation of the Sick, in the Missal of Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1050–1052, there is one of these litanies. In it, after the petition “have mercy on us” to the three Persons in the Blessed Trinity, the words, “pray for him,” are addressed to the Blessed Virgin, the apostles, and other saints. In the Rede Book of Darbye we have a similar litany, in which we find the names of the following saints, Alban, Oswald, Eadmund, Swithin, Dunstan, Ætheldrytha, Ermenhilda. In the York Manual we find a litany of the saints which

was used during the benediction of the font on Holy Saturday. And in a Sarum Missal, about A.D. 1400, we have a bidding prayer which begins: "Ye shall stand up and bid your beads" (offer your prayers) "to our Lord Jesus Christ, and to our Lady Saint Mary, and to all the company of heaven for the state of holy Church and for our Mother Church of Rome, and for our Lord the Pope," &c.*

And especially was the Blessed Virgin, "the Queen of all Saints," invoked. The Rev. T. E. Bridgett, in his *Our Lady's Dowry*, says: "a MS. now in the University Library at Cambridge, called the Book of Cerne, and which belonged to Ethelwald, Bishop of Sherbourne in 760, contains the following prayer to the Blessed Virgin, a clear monument both of the faith and devotion of the Anglo-Saxons in the time of Venerable Bede: 'Holy Mother of God, Virgin ever blest, glorious and noble, chaste and inviolate, O Mary Immaculate, chosen and beloved of God, endowed with singular sanctity, worthy of all praise, thou who art the advocate for the sins of the whole world; O listen, listen, listen to us, O holy Mary—pray for us, intercede for us, disdain not to help us. For we are confident and know for certain that thou canst obtain all thou willest from thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, God Almighty, the King of ages, who liveth with the Father and the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen.' Ælfric in the tenth century says: "Let us also be mindful of how great dignity is the holy Maiden Mary, the Mother of Christ. She is blessed above all women; she is the heavenly Queen, and the comfort and support of all Christian men. Our old mother Eve shut to us the gate of heaven's Kingdom; and the holy Mary opened it again to us, if we ourselves by evil works shut it not against us. Much may she obtain of her Child, if she be fervently thereof reminded. Let us therefore, with great fervour, pray to her that she may mediate for us to her own Child, who is both her Creator and her Son." And in a Saxon prayer, written just before or soon after the conquest, we find the following

* *Publications of the Surtees Society.*

words: "I have no refuge but in thee, O my Lady, O holy Mary; therefore on my knees I beg that thou wilt intercede for me with our Lord God, that by thy holy prayers He may deign to forgive me all my sins."* Canon Simmons, in one of his notes in the *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, gives us this prayer from the York Horæ: "O blesseyd lady Moder of Jesu and Virgin immaculate, that arte welle of comforte, and moder of mercy, senguler helper to all that trust to the, be now gracyous lady mediatrice and meane unto thi blyssed Sone our Saviour Jesu for me, that by thyn intercessions I may obtayne my desires ever to be your seruaunt in all humilite. And by the helpe and socour of all holy saintes hereafter in perpetual ioy euer to lyve with the. Amen."

It is often said that the language addressed to the Blessed Virgin in Catholic books is a modern development, is ultramontane; but in what does it differ from that used by our Catholic ancestors? Let us see what the teaching of the Established Church is on this subject. In Article xxii. it is said that "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory. . . . and also the invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented." And in accordance with this new idea litanies of the saints were no longer used; the "Hail Mary" and the invocation of Mary and of the saints no longer appeared in the Prayer Book, or Primer; the images and shrines of the Blessed Virgin and the saints were destroyed; Lady Chapels were disused; and the Angelus bell ceased to be heard. So thorough was the "reform" with regard to the invocation of saints that even the most extreme High Churchmen have not yet ventured openly to revive it. Here then is another essential in which there is no identity between the pre-Reformation Church and the Established Church.

Extreme Unction.

I will only take one more essential, and that is the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. In Leofric's Sacramentary (tenth Century), and in pre-Reformation Pontificals and Manuals, we find the order of administering the

* pp. 23, 37, 142.

Sacrament of Extreme Unction. This sacrament which is thus spoken of by the apostle St. James—"Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him"—and which, like the other sacraments, was generally made use of, and highly valued by our Catholic ancestors, is said in Article xxv., "to have grown of the corrupt following of the apostles," and has more thoroughly disappeared from the Established Church, than even the invocation of saints. The saints are invoked occasionally in private, and Anglicans have been known to tell their friends in confidence that they have "a great devotion to our Lady;" but I have never yet heard of an Anglican clergyman administering Extreme Unction—another proof that in essentials the Established Church is not identical with the pre-Reformation Church.

No one can deny that the Headship of the Church, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Invocation of Saints, and Extreme Unction are essentials; and as regards these, I think I have proved that the Established Church is not identical with the pre-Reformation Church of England. I could bring forward other essentials with the same result; I could enumerate many pious beliefs and pious customs which were universal in this country when Englishmen were all Catholics: but the essentials I have chosen are quite sufficient for my purpose.

And now I would ask: How can it be possible for the Anglican Church, which has given up so many essentials, to be the same as the Old Church of England, to be a continuation of that Church? High Churchmen believe that Christ founded a Church, that He sent down the Holy Spirit to guide that Church into all truth, that that Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth," and I would ask them to explain how it is, that this one continuous Church of England, which they talk about, has varied so much in its teaching; how it is, that this Church has taught the people for nearly a thousand years

that the Pope is the Head of the Church on earth, that in the Blessed Sacrament Jesus Christ is present under the outward appearance of bread and wine, that the Eucharistic rite is not only a Communion, but a sacrifice which can be offered up for the living and the dead, that the Saints should not only be honoured, but invoked, and that Extreme Unction is a sacrament and generally necessary for the sick; and that this same Church (as they say it is) has also for the last three hundred years been teaching the English people that what their ancestors had been taught for nearly a thousand years with regard to these essentials, and had believed, was all wrong, was deadly error, and what is more, has been enforcing this new teaching by penal laws. I would ask our High Church friends how a Church of this kind can be an infallible teacher and guide of men in spiritual things, as Christ promised His Church should be?

If Anglicans will only study history carefully, and with a desire to arrive at the truth, they must be led to see that the Church which is the same as the Church of Old England and which is a continuation of that Church, is not the established Church, but the Catholic Church in England; that Church which, though cruelly persecuted for nearly three hundred years, has through all these years kept alive the old faith. As of old, she acknowledges the Pope as the Head of the Church, and is Catholic, a part of that one spiritual Empire which is spread throughout the world, and comprehends men, not of one race only, but of all races. As of old, Christ is present on her altars to receive the homage of his people, to accept their thanksgivings, to hear their prayers, and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is offered up in her churches for the living and the dead. As of old, she teaches her children to honour the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints, and to seek their powerful help. As of old, her children can avail themselves of the Sacrament of Penance, and the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. As of old, Benedictines, and Franciscans, and Dominicans minister at her altars, and form part of her organization. As of old, Christians of all nations find themselves at home in her churches.

“By their fruits ye shall know them.”

THE
FOREIGN AND ENGLISH
“REFORMATION.”

How did its AUTHORS describe the RESULTS
of their Labours?

MARTIN LUTHER himself declares (A.D. 1525—1540): “I hold that those who have become Evangelicals *have become worse than they were before they received the Gospel*. Unfortunately, it is our daily experience, that those who live under our Gospel are more spiteful, more passionate, more greedy, avaricious, and quarrelsome, than ever they were under the Papacy” (*Hauspostill*, Walch’s Edit. of Luther’s works, vol. xiii. pp. 2193, 2195).

“Hitherto our doctrine *has only served to increase the misconduct of the world*: wherever it has been received, it has made men more avaricious, more unmerciful, and more impatient of discipline” (*Hauspostill*, Walch, v. xiii. p. 19).

“Our Germany, notwithstanding the great light of the gospel, seems to be all but possessed by the devil. Our youths are impudent and unruly, and will no longer submit to education; the old men are loaded with sins of avarice, usury, and many others that may not be told” (*Ausleg. des 1 Buch. Mos.*, Walch, i. p. 2451).

“People are now possessed with seven devils, whereas formerly they were possessed with one devil: the devil now enters into the people in crowds, so that *men are now much more avaricious, unmerciful, impure, insolent, than formerly under the Pope*.” (*Hauspost.*, Walch, xiii. 19).

"Now our Evangelicals are becoming *seven times worse than they were before*; for, after we have learned the Gospel, we steal, lie, cheat, eat and drink, and give way to every vice. Verily, if we have cast out one evil spirit, *seven others, worse than the first, have now entered in and taken possession of us*, as is to be seen in princes, nobles, gentry, citizens, and peasants—who behave without shame, disregarding God and His threats" (*Ausleg. d. V. Buch. Mos.*, Walch, vol. iii. p. 2727).

"It appears, finally, that those who ought to be perfect Christians, because they have received the Gospel, are, on the contrary, *worse and less merciful than they ever were before, as is only too obvious*. Formerly, when men were misled by the deceptions and false worship of the Pope, they were ready and willing to do good works; *but now, on the contrary, all the world has learned nothing else but to hoard, defraud, and openly to rob and steal, with lies, deceptions, usury, cheating; and every one deals with his neighbour as if he were his enemy*. . . . Such are now-a-days *the growing habits of all classes*—princes, nobles, citizens, and peasants—in short of every one" (*Kirchenpostill*, Walch, vol. p. 2521.)

CALVIN writes: "When so many thousands of men, having shaken off the Papal authority, enrolled themselves eagerly, as it seemed, under the Gospel, how few among them repented of their vices! Nay! what else have *the majority* shown to have been their desire, but that, having shaken off the yoke of superstition, *they might launch out with the greater freedom into every kind of lasciviousness?*" (*De Scandalis*, Op., Edit. Amstelod, 1677, vol. viii. p. 71.)

"It is a matter of no small importance," he writes to Melancthon in 1552, "that we should not allow any suspicion of the *divisions* that have broken out amongst us to pass down to posterity. *For it is above measure absurd that we, who have been obliged to cut ourselves off from the whole Christian world, should fall asunder from each other at the very beginning of our undertaking*" (*Epist. ad Melancth.*, vol. ix. p. 66).

MARTIN BUCER avows that the great majority of the "reformed" had only changed their religion for the sake of worldly advantages, and freedom from all religious restraint; "and," he adds, "it was by no means displeasing to them to hear that 'we are justified by faith in Christ and not by good works,' *since for these latter they had no relish. . . .* A good number of them only received the preaching of the Gospel *in order that they might be able to plunder the goods of the churches*" (*De Regno Christi*, l. i. c. 4. Edit. Basil., 1577, p. 24). "It is but to well objected against us, that, whilst we loudly condemn the prayers, fasts and other ancient religious observances, *we ourselves, on the other hand, neither pray, fast, watch, nor labour; but have regard only to good living and the gratification of the senses; anxious to spy out evils in others, to whom we ourselves are in no way superior*" (*Enarrat, in Quat. Evang.* fol. 70).

DUDITH, writing to his fellow-reformer Beza, says: "Our Churches themselves are contending against one another with deadly hatred and terrible anathemas. The chief theologians have no fixed belief, but coin a creed altogether different from that which they had just before professed, and from that of all other Christians, and this form of belief only lasts them for a month. . . . *In what single point of religion are these Churches which have declared war against the Roman Pontiff agreed amongst themselves?*" (*Beza Epist. Theol. Genevæ*, 1575, p. 5.)

CAPITO, the colleague of Bucer in the administration of the Church of Strasburg, writes to Farel, A.D. 1537:—"The Lord grants me to learn what it is to be a pastor, and how much evil we have done by our hasty judgment and inconsiderate vehemence in throwing off the Pontifical authority. For the multitude, after being accustomed, and encouraged to license, has now altogether thrown off the bridle; as though by breaking down the authority of the Papists, we made void the

power of the Word, of the Sacraments, and of the whole office of the ministry. For they cry out:—*‘I know enough of the Gospel; I can read it myself; what need have I of your assistance?’*” (*Epist. ad Farel, inter Calvini Epist.* Op. Tom. ix. p. 2.)

WILLIBALD PIRCKHEIMER, writing in 1528, says:—“I know, and it is the truth, that even unbelievers were not guilty of such fraud and crime as those are who call themselves ‘Evangelicals.’ For the fact is evident to be seen, that *there is now neither faith nor hope, no fear of God, no love of one’s neighbour; but there is a rejection of mercy and goodness, of art and learning; nor do they now think of aught save the gratification of the body,*” etc. (Epistle to Tscherte, in *Reliquien von Albrecht Duer*, Nuremburg, 1828, p. 166.)

ERASMUS, who had for some time sympathized with the “Reformers,” after ample experience of the results of their teaching, thus wrote to Vulturius Neocomus: “Look around on this ‘Evangelical’ people, and observe whether amongst them less indulgence is given to luxury, lust or avarice, than amongst those [Catholics] whom you so detest. Show me any one person who by that ‘gospel’ has been reclaimed from drunkenness to sobriety, from fury and passion to meekness, from avarice to liberality, from reviling to well-speaking, from wantonness to modesty. *I will show you a great many who have become worse through following it. . . . It may be my misfortune, but never yet have I happened to know any person who did not seem to have deteriorated under its influence*” (*Epist.* Edit. Lond. 1642, lib. xxxi. epist. 47, col. 2054, seq.). “Those whom I had formerly known to be pure, upright, and free from guile,” he says in another letter, “I found, *after they had joined this sect* (the Lutherans), to have become licentious in conversation, gamblers, neglectful of prayer, absorbed in worldly pursuits, most impatient of injury, implacable,

slanderers, vain, as spiteful as serpents, and utterly devoid of human feeling" (lib. xxxi. epist. 59, col. 2118).

"Luther's popularity daily increases. Now certain Frenchmen are more mad than any Germans. All have in their mouths five words—'The Gospel,' 'The word of God,' 'Faith,' 'Christ,' and 'The Spirit;' and yet I see many of them here to be such, that I cannot doubt that they were impelled by the spirit of Satan" (lib. xviii., epist. 49, col. 811). "I see a people springing up from whom my soul turns away in utter abhorrence. Concord, charity, faith, discipline, morals, good order,—all are perishing" (lib. xx., epist. 3, col. 960). "I see no one made any better, but all, whom I knew intimately, to have become worse; insomuch that it grieves me greatly that formerly, in my writings, I declared for 'liberty of the spirit;' though I did so with a good intention, never dreaming that such a race as this was about to spring up. I was desirous that there should be some abatement in human ceremonies, in order that true piety might gain much increase. Now, however, these ceremonies are got rid of in such manner, that to liberty of spirit succeeds an unbridled license of the flesh. Certain cities of Germany are filled with erroneous doctrines, with deserters of monasteries, with married priests, and with multitudes of famished and naked wretches. *Nothing else is thought of but dancing, eating, drinking, and intrigue.* They teach not, neither do they learn; there is no sobriety of life, no sincerity. *Wherever they are, there lie prostrate all good discipline and piety*" (lib. xx., epist. 18, col. 984).

KING HENRY VIII. (for we must now give a few testimonies regarding the moral effects of the "Reformation" in our own country) said in his last speech to Parliament: "The Bible itself is turned into wretched rhymes, sung and jangled in every ale-house and tavern. *I am sure that charity was never so faint among ye, virtue never at a lower ebb, and God Himself*

never less honoured or worse served in Christendom" (Stow's *Annals*; and Collier's *Ecclesiast. Hist.* p. ii. b. iii. p. 218).

BISHOP LATIMER, in his Seventh Sermon before Edward VI., said: "I never saw, surely, so little discipline as is now-a-days. Men will be masters; they will be masters and no disciples. Alas! where is this discipline now in England? The people regard no discipline, they be without all order. . . . *Men, the more they know, the worse they be*: it is truly said, '*Scientia inflat*,' knowledge maketh us proud, and causeth us to forget all, and set away discipline. *Surely in Popery they had a reverence; but now we have none at all.* I never saw the like!" etc., etc, (*Serm. XIII.* Parker Society Edit., p. 230).

"There is in London," he elsewhere says, "as much pride, covetousness, cruelty, oppression, and superstition as ever there was in Nebo. . . . *London was never so ill as it is now. In times past men were full of piety and compassion, but now there is no piety*; for in London their brother shall die in the streets for cold, he shall lie sick at the door between stock and stock, and perish there for hunger: Was there ever more unmercifulness in Nebo? I think not. In times past, when any rich man died in London, they were wont to help the poor scholars of the Universities, and bequeath great sums of money for the relief of the poor; but now charity is waxen cold, none helpeth the scholar, nor yet the poor" (*Sermon of the Plough, ib.* p. 63).

BRADFORD, another English "Reformer," says: "All men may see that *immorality in its foulest forms, pride, dishonesty, unmercifulness, scoffing at religion and virtue, and a desire to oppress and crush down the poor*, far surpassed at this time anything that before occurred in the realm" (*On the Condition of Public Morals and the People's Povertie*). And in a letter to Archbishop Cranmer the same author says: "A heavy curse seems to have fallen on the people; I know not what to think of it. Desolation overshadows this land of ours, that was ever so prosperous and contented."

CAMDEN, the Protestant annalist, states that "Sacrilegious avarice ravenously invaded Church livings, colleges, chantries, hospitals, and places dedicated to the poor, as things superfluous. *Ambition and emulation among the nobility, presumption and disobedience among the common people, grew so extravagant that England seemed to be in a downright frenzy*" (*Chronicle on Edward's Reign*).

BISHOP BARLOW writes in 1553:—"Mark it substantially, in cities and towns where ye see the people the most rifest and most busy to prate of the Gospel, whether they be or be not as great usurers, deceivers of their neighbours, blasphemous swearers, evil speakers, and given to all vices as deeply as ever they were. *This I am sure of, and dare boldly affirm, that sith the time of this new contentious learning the dread of God is greatly quenched, and charitable compassion sore abated*" (*A Dialogue on the Lutheran Faccions*, 1553).

BISHOP PARKER writes to Bullinger in 1562: "Religion is in the same state among us as heretofore. . . . Almost all are covetous, all love gifts. *There is no truth, no liberality, no knowledge of God.* Men have broken forth to curse and to lie, and murder and steal and commit adultery," etc. (*Zurich Letters*, Parker Society Edit. n. xlv. p. 108.)

BISHOP PILKINGTON writes in 1585: "Religion is the chiefest help that God has given us to know Him by, to bridle our ill-affections, and desires withal, to make us love one another, and set forth His glory; and yet, if we look into ourselves in these days, we shall find that there never was greater cruelty, oppression of the poor, hypocrisy and dissembling in God's cause, and unmercifulness amongst men in this land, *than hath been since the beginning of the reforming*

of religion amongst us; yea, and this is more wonderful, of such as would pretend to be favourers of religion. . . . Things be fresh in memory, and cannot be forgotten of them that will not willingly be blind; but they that list to read may see in that worthy father Master Latimer's Sermons, many such things opened that then were preached; and would to God they were now reformed, or not fallen to worse and more shameful dealings, without hope of amendment. . . . Everyone in his degree useth craft, subtlety, and deceit, to oppress, undermine, and snatch from others, without respect of friend or foe, what he can, not regarding how he cometh by it, by hook or crook, by right or wrong," etc. (*Works*, Parker Society Edit. pp. 461, 465.)*

Protestant writers are constantly telling us of the great corruption of morals that existed in some Catholic countries during the period preceding the revolt of Luther. They appear to be ignorant of the fact, that the "Reformers" themselves, with one voice declared, that matters became far worse after the spread of their new doctrines, and amongst the great majority of those who embraced them.

* For copious proofs of the generally infamous character of the Protestant clergy in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, see Mr. Buckle's Article in *Fraser's Magazine* for August, 1867; also Dr. F. G. Lee's *Church under Queen Elizabeth*.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, 21 Westminster Bridge Road,
London, S.E.

[Price 2s. per 100.]

WHY SHOULD WE REMEMBER THE FIFTH OF NOVEMBER?

ST. MATTHEW x. 21. "The brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the son; and the children shall rise up against their parents, and shall put them to death.

"And you shall be hated by all men for My Name's sake: but he that shall persevere unto the end, he shall be saved."

From these words of our Divine Lord Himself, it is quite evident that His true followers are to expect persecution.

Indeed we may say, that to suffer persecution is one of the marks of true discipleship. "If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you" (St. John xv. 20).

Brief, temporary, spasmodic suffering of persecution is not enough, neither are mere individual cases sufficient, but the continuous subjection of the whole community to the hostility of what the Holy Scripture calls "the world,"—*that* is the real test. "Because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (St. John xv. 19).

Now, the Church of England will not truly bear this test, that is to say, if you take the whole of its three hundred years' existence.

Made by a king, it came into the world with every earthly advantage; a fortune, taken from others, was given to it at its very birth, property in all directions was bestowed upon it, so that it could never say that it had "nowhere to lay its head." And if any one went out into the wilderness to see it, it was not to be found there, for it was clothed in soft raiment from the first, and dwelt in king's palaces.

True, during a few short years, an attempt was made by those who had fallen among robbers, and been stripped and wounded and left half dead, to recover their stolen property—and this surely was not unnatural. In the attempt some hard blows were dealt back—the outcome of human nature, which is prone to retaliate—but the poor

stripped and wounded ones were soon overpowered again, and subjected to a long, slow system of torture, which was more grievous than the first violence.

The history of the Church of England, from the Reformation to the present time, cannot be said to have been one of persecution suffered. Rather has it been petted and pampered; and if it has suffered at all, it has been from its own indolence, engendered by a life of too great comfort and ease.

How different has been the lot of Catholics in England during the same three hundred years! The rightful owners of all the stolen property, they have not even been allowed in peace to pick up the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. The very dogs were driven away if they attempted to lick their sores. Until quite lately, within memory of the living, Catholics have been subjected to a long series of persecutions. And from whom? From the Church of England and its heads, the sovereign and bishops.

Would you believe that the amiable, easy-going Church of England would ever pose as a persecutor? Yet it is no exaggeration to say that for three hundred years she has, without ceasing, cruelly trod upon and tortured the poor Catholic, until existence in this world became almost impossible.

People cry out about Queen Mary and her bloody reign, but what are *five short years* [1553—1558] compared with three hundred? As the Protestant Cobbett says: "Talk of the 'Fires in Smithfield!' Fires, indeed, which had no justification, and which all Catholics severely condemn: but what, good God! was the death of about two hundred and seventy-seven persons, however cruel and unmerited that death, to the torments inflicted for more than two hundred years on millions upon millions of people, to say nothing about the thousands of Catholics who were, during that period, racked to death, killed in prison, hanged, bowelled and quartered!"

Do you really know what Catholics have suffered from the Church of England kings and queens, bishops, clergy and people?

You may read it in history, beginning with the reign of

Henry VIII., the founder of the Establishment, and onwards down to almost our own day.

If I refer you to Lingard's *History of England*, where full accounts may be seen, you may regard him as unduly prejudiced in favour of Catholics, he having been one himself; so I will take from the pages of the Protestant Cobbett the following facts, unknown or forgotten by thousands who are ready enough to denounce Queen Mary and the Fires of Smithfield:

"Catholics were fined £20 a month if they stayed away from the Church of England Service, to attend which was against their conscience.

"Catholics were not allowed to be guardians or executors; not allowed to practise Law or Physic; not allowed to travel five miles from their house.

"A Catholic woman, if she stayed away from the Church of England Service, might be imprisoned during her husband's lifetime, unless ransomed by him at £10 a month.

"If a Catholic, when called upon by any four Justices of the Peace to abjure his religion, refused to do so, he could be sentenced by them to banishment for life (without judge or jury), and if he returned, he was to suffer death.

"Catholics were not allowed to educate their children in their own religion, unless they paid a fine of £10 a month, while the Catholic schoolmaster was fined £2 a day.

"If Catholic parents sent their children to Catholic schools abroad, they were fined £100.

"The saying of Mass, which is the service most dear to Catholics, incurred the fine of £120, while those who were present at the Mass had to pay £60 for the privilege."

So much for the system whereby Catholics were gradually impoverished and reduced to starvation. But this was not all. Not only were their money and their property not safe, but not even their lives. If a Catholic priest returned from beyond the seas, to exercise his ministry in this once Catholic country, he was punished with hanging, ripping out of the bowels, and quartering: and the same fate awaited any one who returned to the Faith of his Fathers, or induced others to do so.

And this sort of thing went on, sometimes with greater and sometimes with less severity, for about three hundred

years, and yet we do not hear the Protestants of England denouncing *these* cruelties. O no! they are passed over in silence—and why? Because Catholics were the sufferers, because Protestants were the persecutors, and it would not do to make such facts known. So people have been kept in ignorance of *this* side of history, and have been taught to believe that for three hundred years in England the only persecutors have been those wicked Catholics.

“Even a worm will turn.” And if all the Catholics, all over England, in the reign of James I., when this grinding torture was in full swing, had risen against their torturers, it would scarcely have been surprising. You may goad human nature beyond endurance: and it was because Catholics are human, that a few of them, driven to desperation, formed the diabolical plot known as “Gunpowder Treason,” for the purpose of blowing to atoms the framers of these cruel laws. All must condemn such an act of vengeance and retaliation, Catholics quite as much as Protestants. But all, also, should weigh well the extreme provocation which led to such a plot being concocted. Neither should it be forgotten that the sufferers had sought redress in legitimate ways, and had earnestly begged the King to remove the heavy burdens which were crushing heart and life out of them. But their petitions were made to deaf ears, or rather, to hearts that heard but pitied not.

Again, in all fairness, it should be remembered how very few the conspirators were: only twelve or thirteen, out of the large number of Catholics still existing in England. This handful, with Catesby as their ringleader, kept their deadly secret to themselves. It is absurd to suppose that the whole Catholic body were cognizant of it: if they had been, the conspirators would never have escaped arrest until so late as the eve of the 5th of November. Is it fair to condemn all Catholics for the misdeeds of a dozen?

For the same reason, it is most unfair to associate the Pope with a plot which never came to his knowledge until after the event. Indeed, at this very time a letter had come from the Pope to a priest, Father Garnet,* whose suspicions had been aroused by Catesby’s mysterious behaviour, com-

* See *Father Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot*. Catholic Truth Society. 6d.

manding him to keep aloof from all political intrigue, and to discourage all attempts against the State.

As for the conspirators themselves, they tried to persuade their consciences that the violent means they proposed to use for redressing their wrongs were lawful, since milder ones had failed. "There could be no doubt it was lawful," Catesby argued with Robert Winter, "since God had given to every man the right of repelling force by force. If his friend thought it cruel, let him compare it with the cruelties exercised during so many years against the Catholics; let him reckon the number that had been butchered by the knife of the executioner; the hundreds who had perished in the solitude of their prisons; and the thousands that had been reduced from affluence or ease to a state of want or beggary."

But in spite of such arguments, the courage of some of them faltered, and the prorogation of Parliament caused delays, which damped the ardour of the less enthusiastic amongst them.

Yet at this very time, the persecution against the Catholics was daily increasing in severity. A priest and five laymen were executed, and several more sentenced to death, though reprieved. A Mr. Pound, for simply complaining of the injustice of such sentences, was, being a Catholic, condemned to lose both his ears, to pay a fine of £1000, and to endure perpetual imprisonment. The houses of Catholics were entered at night and searched, and gentlewomen even dragged out of their beds that these might be examined lest they should conceal any article of Catholic worship. The jails were crowded with prisoners, and some missionaries and laymen suffered, more were condemned to suffer, death for religious offences. Nor were the Church of England bishops behindhand in zeal against the Catholics. The penalties were exacted with such rigour by the Protestant bishops of Hereford and Llandaff, that in the county of Hereford alone, four hundred and nine families suddenly found themselves reduced to a state of beggary.

Such deeds as these served well to stimulate the failing courage of the conspirators, reviving again the bitter feelings of despair and desire for revenge.

The hiring of the cellar under the Houses of Parliament, the storage there of two hogsheads and about thirty barrels of gunpowder, the concealment of these beneath the supposed winter-fuel, the discovery of the plot through the letter to Lord Mounteagle, the arrest of Guy Fawkes in the cellar a little after midnight of the 4th of November, these are circumstances probably too well known, because so long kept before the public memory, to need detailed recapitulation.

Guy Fawkes, when examined, avowed his object to have been to destroy the Parliament, as the sole means of putting an end to religious persecution, and to a Scotch nobleman he declared, that so large a quantity of gunpowder had been collected for the purpose of "blowing the Scottish beggars back to their native mountains." This last remark of his showed one of the places where the shoe pinched. The heavy fines wrung from Catholics were needed by James to pacify his greedy Scotch favourites. This Catholics knew, and the knowledge did not serve to soften their sense of the wrong done to them.

All the conspirators met with the death which they had justly incurred and rightly deserved.

Four of them, including Catesby, were mortally wounded in the pursuit, and eight were arraigned. They pleaded "not guilty," maintaining that their intention was innocent before God. Some of them had already lost most of their property, all had suffered severely on account of their religion. The King had broken his promise of toleration, and the malice of their enemies daily aggravated their burdens.

No means of liberation was left but that which they had adopted. Their only object was to relieve themselves and their brethren from the cruelty of the persecutors, and to restore a worship which in their conscience they believed to be the true religion of Christ, and which had been the religion of England for a thousand years.

Thus they pleaded extenuating circumstances, but of course without avail. They suffered on the scaffold the punishment of traitors.

Why not let them rest? They were punished with death, in addition to all the punishment they had to undergo for

their faith during their life. Why not leave them alone now? Are Protestants so revengeful and bloodthirsty, that even after two hundred and eighty years they must still rake up the misdeeds of the dead; and are they so unjust that they must also insult the innocent as well as the guilty? Where is the forgiving spirit, the charity of that Gospel of which they so loudly proclaim themselves the true followers?

But if somebody must be burnt, some memory execrated, why not turn upon the true authors of the Plot—the King and his favourites, and the Church of England, who, by refusing justice and mercy to the Catholics, drove that handful of them to desperation?

In conclusion. Let the proverb be remembered, “Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.”

Stones are thrown at Catholics for the attempt to blow up Parliament with gunpowder, but similar attempts have been made by Protestants, and at about the same period. At Antwerp, some of them endeavoured to blow up the Prince of Parma with his nobility; and one in the Hague plotted to blow up the whole Council of Holland.

Why are not these remembered?

Again, how continually has it been dinned in our ears that the Catholics massacred the Huguenots. This is never forgotten. But such horrible massacres as those at Drogheda and Wexford by the staunchly Protestant Cromwell and his followers are never mentioned. Reader! honestly, have you ever heard of these? Perhaps not, for the victims were Catholics this time. Yet I think if I tell you what Thomas Wood, one of Cromwell’s soldiers, and an eye-witness, relates of the massacre of Drogheda, you will in common fairness allow that Catholics are not the only butchers.

Drogheda was taken by storm on the 11th of September, 1649. No quarter was given to the vanquished defenders, but what was worse, even the townspeople, including the women and children, who had fled to the Catholic Church of St. Peter for safety, were all put to the sword without mercy. In the crypt of the church some ladies had taken refuge. Thither, after the general carnage in the church above, the bloodthirsty soldiers found their way. “I found there,” says Thomas Wood, “the flower and choicest of the women and ladies belonging to the town, amongst whom a

most handsome virgin, arrayed in costly and gorgeous apparel, kneeled down to me with tears and prayers to save her life. Being stricken with pity, I took her under my arm, with intention to put her over the works to shift for herself, but a soldier, perceiving this intention, ran his sword up her body. Whereupon, seeing her gasping, I took away her money, jewels, &c., and flung her down over the works." The same man records that three thousand at least, besides some women and children, were, after the assailants had taken part, and afterwards all the town, put to the sword on the 11th and 12th of September, 1649. He bears witness to having seen the soldiers, when making their way up to the galleries and lofts of the church, take "each of them a child, and use it as a buckler of defence, when they ascended the steps, to keep themselves from being shot or brained."

On the 1st of October, Cromwell arrived near Wexford, and entered it through the treachery of the captain of the castle. The garrison and burghers assembled in the market-place, where also were crowded all the old men, women, and children. A stiff resistance was offered by the Catholics to the Puritan invaders, but the latter gained the mastery and put to the sword every human being found in the place. The women and children had clustered round the great cross, but its sacred shadow was no protection against the fanaticism of the Puritan. Fifteen hundred are said to have been put to death, and "thus," wrote Cromwell to the Government, "it has pleased God to give into your hands this other mercy, for which, as for all, we pray God may have all the glory. Indeed, your instruments are poor and weak, and can do nothing but through believing, and that is the gift of God also."

Reader, *audi alteram partem*. Hear the other side. You have heard a little bit of it now.

I appeal to your sense of fairness, and with greater confidence repeat the question with which I began—

Why should we remember the Fifth of November?

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE REFORMATION.

IT is a favourite method with Protestant controversialists of a certain class to endeavour to represent the so-called Reformation as a revolt of the English people against the tyranny of the Pope of Rome. How far this is true can perhaps be sufficiently judged by the following quotations from the writings of three Protestant Historians.

The first is **J. R. Green**, who, speaking of the years 1530 to 1540, the period embracing the renunciation of the supremacy of the Pope and the dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII. says: "While the great revolution which struck down the Church was in progress, England simply held her breath. It is only through the stray depositions of royal spies that we catch a glimpse of the **wrath and hate** which lay seething under this terrible silence of a whole people. For the silence was a **silence of terror**. . . . It was the **English terror**" (*Short History of the English People*, p. 334). And again, referring to the same years: "Agrarian discontent and the **love of the old religion** united in a revolt which broke out in **Lincolnshire**. The rising was hardly suppressed when **Yorkshire was in arms**. From every parish the farmers

marched with the parish priest at their head upon York, and the surrender of the city determined the waverers. In a few days Skipton Castle, where the Earl of Cumberland held out with a handful of servants, was the only spot north of the Humber which remained true to the King. Durham rose. . . . The whole nobility of the North were now in arms, and thirty thousand 'tall men and well horsed' moved on the Don, demanding the reversal of the Royal policy, a reunion with Rome, the restoration of Catherine's daughter, Mary, to her rights as heiress of the Crown, redress of the wrongs done to the Church, and above all the fall of Cromwell. Though their advance was checked by negotiation, the organization of the revolt went steadily on throughout the winter, and a Parliament of the North, gathered at Pomfret, and formally adopted the demands of the insurgents. Only six thousand men under Norfolk barred their way southward, and the Midland Counties were known to be disaffected." This, if you please, is the description given by a modern Protestant historian of the "Pilgrimage of Grace" which generations of Protestant children were taught to look upon as a rising of a few superstitious fanatics, hardly worth recording, but which in reality, was the revolt of the English nation against the so-called 'Blessed' Reformation.

Green goes on to relate how, having pledged himself to the fulfilling of the people's demands, and thereby having induced them to disband, the infamous Henry

VIII. broke his promise and deluged the country with the people's blood.

The second historian is **Hallam**, who writes thus:

"An historian (Burnet), whose bias was certainly not unfavourable to Protestantism, confesses that all **endeavours were too weak to overcome the aversion of the people towards reformation**, and even intimates that German troops were sent for from Calais on account of the **bigotry with which the bulk of the nation adhered to the old superstition**. This is somewhat a humiliating admission that the **Protestant faith was imposed upon our ancestors by a foreign army.**" (*History of England*, i. p. 92.)

The third historian is no less a Protestant than **Mr. J. A. Froude**, who can find no better words wherein to describe the effects of the so-called "Reformation" in the year 1553 than the following:

"To the Universities the Reformation had brought with it **desolation**. To the people of England it had brought **misery and want**. . . . The once open hand was closed, the once open heart was hardened; the ancient loyalty of man to man was exchanged for **scuffling of selfishness**; the change of faith had brought with it **no increase of freedom and less of charity**. The prisons were crowded as before with sufferers for opinion, and the **creed of a thousand years was made a crime by a doctrine of yesterday**; monks and nuns wandered by hedge and highway as missionaries of

discontent, and pointed with bitter effect to the fruits of the new belief which had been **crimsoned in the blood of thousands of English peasants**. The people of England were not yet so much in love with wretchedness that they would set aside, for the sake of it, a princess whose injuries pleaded for her, and whose title was affirmed by Act of Parliament. In the tyranny under which the nation was groaning the moderate men of all creeds looked to the accession of Mary as the rolling away of **some bad black nightmare**." (*History of England*, vi. p. 28.)

Englishmen! Remember this blood of your forefathers, which still cries to God for vengeance, whenever you hear the Faith, for which they laid down their lives, slandered and abused. For their sakes inquire into the truth of this **religion of which you have been robbed**, the only religion of this country for nearly a thousand years, and to-day, the religion of the vast majority of your fellow Christians all over the world.

The **Roman Catholic religion** is the only religion founded by **our Lord Jesus Christ**, Who has promised to be with it "all days" (St. Matt. xxviii. 20), and has declared that the "**gates of hell shall not prevail against it**." (St. Matt. xvi. 18.)

England's Title: Our Lady's Dowry:

Its History and Meaning.

BY THE REV. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R.

IN 1893, Pope Leo XIII. celebrated his Episcopal Jubilee, and pilgrimages went from all parts of the world to the Holy City, to offer him the homage and congratulations of the faithful. In February, the English pilgrims, conducted by the Duke of Norfolk, were admitted to an audience, and presented to His Holiness by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster. In his reply to the address, the Pope used the following words :

Those were truly bright days [he had been speaking of England's early history], and it pleases Us to point out two most important religious lessons to be drawn from them ; and as they reflect great credit on your forefathers, so will they, We doubt not, if repeated now, prove to be of the greatest benefit to all your countrymen. The first is the wonderful filial love which burnt within the heart of your forefathers towards the great Mother of God, Christ's happy minister in our salvation, to whose service they consecrated themselves with such abundant proofs of devotion, that the kingdom itself acquired the singular and highly honourable title of "Mary's Dowry." The second lesson relates to the special worship always paid by the English to the Prince of the Apostles, as primary patron of their kingdom. . . . Therefore it is Our most earnest desire that faithful England should once more, with the greatest fervour, revive her devotion to these two Patrons of the faith, these two powerful guardians of all virtue, and, God prompting Us, We most earnestly exhort the faithful

of England to follow the example of their forefathers, and by a solemn religious rite, to dedicate and consecrate the whole country to the Most Holy Mother of God and to the Blessed Prince of the Apostles. Let this expression of Our ardent desire, fraught with much advantage to yourselves, beloved children, be the chief and pleasing return which We make to you for the good wishes which you have brought to Us.

Of course the Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops of England hastened to carry out this desire of the Sovereign Pontiff. In their Letter to the clergy and faithful of the Province of Westminster, dated May 20, 1893, they say: "The Holy Father has used, and thus consecrated, an expression which is familiar to us here, but which has probably never been heard from the mouth of a Pope. He has called this country, *Our Lady's Dowry*. That is to say, he has mentioned with approval that, in the ages of faith, this land was commonly so named."

The Bishops speak of the enthusiasm with which the clergy and laity will unite with themselves in carrying out the wish of the Pope.

Devotion to the Holy Mother of God is, we venture to say, a mark of the Catholics of this country at the present time, just as it was of the generations who lived in the land before the unhappy destruction of the Faith. Devotion to St. Peter, also, is deeply and widely spread. But these are moments when new beginnings are to be made, moments when the spiritual feelings of a community are fanned into a brighter flame by the breath of that Holy Spirit Who breathes where He will. These are God's opportunities, and the servants of God must rise up to meet them. The recent stir and outburst of Catholic love and loyalty could hardly have subsided without leaving its impress upon us all. But when, in addition to the Divine impulse which the events themselves force upon us, we have the express

instruction of the Sovereign Pontiff, there can be no hesitation in resolving to arouse our fervour, and to respond with every effort of generosity to the invitation which it is our happiness to receive. . . .

The Bishops then decreed (1) that a great solemnity should be held in the Church of the Oratory, in London, on June 29th of that year, when after Pontifical High Mass, celebrated by the Cardinal Archbishop, with the assistance of all the Bishops of the Province, and of representatives of the clergy and laity from all parts of England, there should be a solemn Act of Consecration to the Blessed Virgin, and in the afternoon after Pontifical Vespers, an Act of Consecration to the Prince of the Apostles; (2) that this consecration should be renewed in every church throughout England on July 2nd, the feast of our Lady's Visitation; (3) that in all future years, this consecration or dedication should be renewed in every public church, that to our Lady on Rosary Sunday, and that to St. Peter on the Sunday within the octave of his principal festival. On Rosary Sunday, flowers, as a tribute from Our Lady's Dowry, should be solemnly presented before the altar or statue of the Blessed Virgin; and to promote devotion to St. Peter, an altar, or a picture of the Saint, or a *fac-simile* of the statue venerated in the great Roman Basilica of St. Peter, might be fitly erected in all our churches.

It will be remembered with what devotion and solemnity these instructions were carried out in the summer of 1893. It is in order to assist in the renewal and perpetuation of this consecration, as far as our Lady is concerned, that the following pages

not mean simply that England was devout to her, or that England was cherished by her. In such case England might have been called our Lady's servant or daughter, or our Lady's joy and delight; and such titles have been given to most of the Catholic countries of Europe, which have vied one with the other in loyalty and affection to the Queen of Heaven. But the Sovereign Pontiff has said that *Dos Mariæ* is not only a very honourable title, but a singular one, one that belongs specially to England, *perhonorificum nomen et singulare*; and that England may continue to merit this title he wished that a dedication should be made by solemn rite; and in doing this, he says, the English of the present day will imitate the example of their forefathers. The very word then implies an endowment or dotation of England to our Lady, and that it was made by some one who had power to make it, either by the nation as a body or by its representatives in Church or State.

We shall see immediately that history bears witness to such an act of consecration having been formerly made. The reader must not, however, be surprised if the records of this act are scanty. In the sixteenth century not only a religious fanaticism, but a Vandal madness fell upon the nation. There was no more care for art or history than for religion. Every image, statue, picture, or representation, on altar or on wall, in window or in book, was burnt, destroyed, effaced; chronicles and books of prayer were sold for waste-paper or consigned to the flames. In 1542, Henry VIII. enjoined that not only rich reliquaries, and gold and silver images of saints, should

be brought to his treasure-house for the melting-pot, but that, to justify this measure under pretext of piety, "all writings and monuments of feigned miracles, wherewith the people be illuded, be taken away in all places of our realm." "If any shrine, covering of shrine, table, monument of miracles, or other pilgrimages do continue, they be so taken away *as there remain no memory of it.*" In the first year of Edward VI. these injunctions were re-issued and more stingently enforced. The clergy were ordered "utterly to extinct and destroy all shrines, . . . pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same on walls, glasses, windows, or elsewhere, within their churches or houses ; and they shall exhort all their parishioners to do the like within their several houses." "Spoliation," writes Professor J. A. Froude, "became the law of the land. The statues crashed from their niches, rood and rood-loft were laid low, and the sunlight stared in white and stainless upon the whitened aisles." In 1550 it was further enacted that if any person have in his custody any books or writings of the sort aforesaid" (*i.e.*, regarding devotion to our Lady or the saints), "or any images, &c., heretofore taken out of any church, and do not, before the last day of June next ensuing, deface and destroy the said images, and deliver the said books to be openly burnt, or otherwise defaced and destroyed, he shall be fined for the first and second offences, and for the third shall suffer imprisonment at the King's will." To pass over the similar sacrileges of the time of Elizabeth, an Act of Parliament was passed in 1605

forbidding the possession of all "superstitious books," (as superstition was understood by the Judges and Bishops of King James), and authorizing justices, mayors, and bailiffs, "from time to time to search the houses and lodgings of every Popish recusant convict, or of every person whose wife is or shall be a Popish recusant convict, for Popish books and relics of Popery." Finally, lest any token should still linger to remind the people that England had once been called *Our Lady's Dowry*, during the fanaticism of the Commonwealth commissions were issued for the utter destruction of even the poor remnants of statuary or painting which, by reason of their insignificance or remote position, or perhaps from some touch of Christian feeling, still remained.

It is no wonder then if we have in England few memorials of the dedication of England to our Lady, though we shall see presently that the very effort to hide has been the means of preservation of one at least, and that the most important. The efforts also to rob poor afflicted Catholics of the consolation they could find in any external objects of piety have laid up in national custody another interesting record that would otherwise have long since perished. In a search made in Catholic houses in the reign of James I. for "Popish" books or writings, a poor little tract or leaflet was discovered, and has been incorporated in a very scurrilous narrative or tirade against Catholics, which was prepared for the press but never printed, and is now amongst the MSS. of the British Museum.¹ The paper runs as follows in modern spelling.

¹ Harleian MSS. n. 360.

JESUS.

That England is Our Lady's Dowry.

In the Church of St. Thomas' Hospital in Rome there is a very fair painted and gilded table of imagery work, standing before the altar of St. Edmund the Martyr, once a King of England, which by the view of the wood and workmanship, seemeth to have been painted above a hundred years past. It is in length about five feet and about three feet high. It is divided into five panes. In the middle pane there is a picture of our Blessed Lady. In the next pane, upon her left hand, kneeleth a young King (St. Edmund, as it is thought) in a side robe of scarlet, who, lifting up his eyes and hands towards our Blessed Lady, and holding between his hands the globe or pattern of England, presenteth the same to our Lady, saying thus :

Dos tua, Virgo pia
Hæc est, quare rege, Maria.

O Blessed Virgin, here behold is thy Dowry,
Defend it now, preserve it still in all prosperity.¹

His sceptre and his crown lying before him on a cushion, and St. George in armour standing behind him in the same pane, somewhat leaning forward, and laying his right hand in such manner on the King's back, that he seemeth to present the King and his presents to our Blessed Lady.²

The reader will probably know that St. Thomas's Hospital was an ancient English royal foundation for the reception of English visitors or pilgrims to the Holy City. In the time of Elizabeth it had been converted into a college for the education of priests for the English Mission, and the writer of the above paper may have been often within its walls. We can

¹ Perhaps a more literal translation would be,

Thy Dowry this, O Virgin sweet,
Then rule it, Mary, as is meet.

² Then follows a long prayer in Latin and English. I have printed it in my book called *Our Lady's Dowry*. Third Edit. p. vi.

but regret that he has described the subjects of only two compartments out of the five.

The church was pulled down during the French revolutionary occupation of Rome, at the end of the last century, and the picture has disappeared, nor is there any record of it in the existing papers of the English College. We are able, however, to some extent, to supply the omission. In Alford's *Fides Regia Britannica*, printed in 1663, in Latin, he says :

From the above mentioned causes arose the devotion of our kings to the Mother of God, to whom they consecrated the realm of England as her Dowry. There exists in Rome in the English College a very ancient picture, in which are represented a king and a queen kneeling and offering the island of Britain to her through the intervention of St. John, with this motto :

Dos tua, Virgo pia
Hæc est ; quare rege, Maria.

From the character of the royal robes interwoven with lilies and eagles in gold (the antiquary) Silvester a Petra Sancta has conjectured with much probability that the king represented is Richard II., the queen, Anne, daughter of the Emperor Charles IV.¹

There can be no doubt that these two writers are describing the same picture. The words of the inscription are identical. If one of them mentions a king only, the other a king and a queen ; one St. George in armour, the other St. John ; yet that all these and other figures also may have been in the picture is indicated by the first writer, since he speaks of five compartments. The conjecture of the writer of the tract that the king is St. Edmund is merely founded on the dedication of the neighbouring altar,

¹ *Fides Regia Britannica*. Auctore P. Michaele Alfordo, alias Griffith, S.J. t. i. p. 59.

and there is little likelihood that the martyr of the year 871 was intended by the artist, for he was King, not of England, but of East Anglia. Alford's and Silvester's conclusion that the kneeling king was Richard II., who died in 1399, is probable, not only on artistic, but on historical grounds. It is still more likely that the young king presented by St. George was the illustrious hero of Agincourt, Henry V., who died in 1422; or again, it may have been one of earlier date, Edward III., who won the Battle of Crecy in 1346.

That Henry V. consecrated his kingdom to our Lady is certain, though he was not the first to do this. A monk named Elmham, who wrote in Latin verse during the King's lifetime an account of his exploits and piety, uses these words,

Anglia dos tua fit, mater pia, Virgo Maria
Henrico rege ; tu tua jura rege,¹

which may be translated,

O Virgin sweet, England is made thy dower,
By royal Henry, keep it by thy power.

The inscription on the Roman picture is evidently derived from these lines of Thomas Elmham. If, then, Henry V. is the king, the queen represented is Catharine, daughter of Charles VI. of France.

There is something in the emphatic and even obtrusive manner in which Elmham uses the word Dowry that shows that it had been lately brought into prominence. In a *Te Matrem Dei laudamus*, or imitation of the *Te Deum*, Elmham writes : " We pray thee, therefore, succour the English, whom thou hast defended as thy own Dowry. Save thy people,

¹ *Memorials of Henry V.* (Rolls Series) p. 121.

O Lady, and deliver thy Dowry from the pestilence of death."¹ And in another part of his poem on Henry, he says that the cry of England at the Battle of Agincourt was :

Virgo Maria fave, propria pro dote ; Georgi
Miles, et Edwarde, Rex pie, confer opem.

"Our Lady for her Dowry ; St. George and St. Edward to our aid !" Now the Battle of Agincourt was fought in 1415, the third year of Henry's reign. The title was therefore, according to Elmham, already well known, and "familiar as a household word" throughout England. And this we know to have been the case, for we have the testimony to it, written fifteen years before, of Thomas Arundel, the Archbishop of Canterbury. In an official letter addressed to his suffragans he says that "the contemplation of the great mystery of the Incarnation, in which the Eternal Word chose the holy and immaculate Virgin, that from her womb He should clothe Himself with flesh, has drawn all Christian nations to venerate her from whom come the first beginnings of our redemption ;" but that "we English, being the servants of her special inheritance, and her own Dowry, as we are commonly called, ought to surpass others in the fervour of our praise and devotion." He then considers how the power of England has increased, and ascribes these successes and this prosperity to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin. Therefore, that our Lady's protection may be continued, at the special desire of the King, he

¹ Elmham wrote this : *Ad Laudem Dei Genitricis Mariæ, propter gloriosam expeditionem regis Henrici V. et pro successu regis Angliæ dotis suæ, quæ cunctas hæreses cum hæresiarcha Joanne Oldcastle suis precibus interemil.*

enjoins that as hitherto the devotion of the faithful has been accustomed to honour Mary at the ringing of the curfew, by saying five times the Angelic Salutation, together with the Lord's Prayer once, so also the bell should be rung early in the morning in all cathedral, collegiate, monastic, and parish churches, and the same prayers be said. He grants an Indulgence to all who perform this devotion.

The King here mentioned was Henry IV., who had just come to the throne, and the date is 1400.¹ As the Archbishop had recently been residing in Germany and France, there is the force of personal testimony in his saying that England was commonly called Our Lady's Dowry. The question, however, still arises as to why, and how long it had been so called. There can be no doubt that the title would never have been given, or would have been rejected as an empty boast, had not England been known far and wide for the splendour of its churches, monuments, and pilgrimages of our Lady, and the devotion of the people; yet, as I have said, not this alone can have originated the "singular title" of Our Lady's Dowry. Do we, then, find any earlier record of dedication or consecration than that of Henry V.? Fortunately such a record has come down to us, and by an irony

¹ The letter or constitution in Wilkins (tom. iii. p. 246) is dated February 10th, 1399, whence Mr. Waterton has concluded that the King referred to was Richard II., who abdicated on September 29th, 1399. But as the new year counted from March 25th, February, 1399, would be February, 1400, in modern reckoning. That such was the case in this instance is evident from the fact that in February, 1399, Archbishop Arundel was in banishment in Cologne. He returned to England with the Duke of Lancaster, and when the Duke ascended the throne as Henry IV., Arundel was reinstated as Archbishop. See Article on Arundel by Mr. Gairdner in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

of Divine Providence it was the impious and sacrilegious efforts of Edward VI. (or his governors) to obliterate all traces of the devotion of his ancestors, "so that there remain no memory of it," which has caused not only the memory, but the very monument and representation of it, to be preserved into the present century. The story need not be long.

The palace of the Kings of England had long been fixed at Westminster. They cherished of course the splendid abbey church rebuilt by St. Edward, and again by Henry III. But, adjoining their palace there was a royal chapel of great size and magnificence dedicated to St. Stephen. The vault or undercroft of this now alone remains, the edifice having been destroyed by fire in 1834.¹ It had been built by King Stephen, and in a more splendid style by Edward III., who completed it in 1360. Either opening into it or close beside it was a smaller chapel of our Lady, called Our Lady of the Pew. This name, the origin of which is disputed, was derived from a still older chapel or image of that title in the neighbouring abbey, which by way of distinction was called the *old* Lady of Pew.² Edward III. had

¹ The external lobby of the present House of Commons is the exact size, and lies on the exact site, of the old House of Commons, and chapel of St. Stephen's.

² On this subject it is enough here to refer to Mr. Edmund Waterton's very complete dissertation in his *Pietas Mariana Britannica*, pp. 227—239. The title has been variously derived from Our Lady of Puy in France, of which there was a confraternity in London, from Puits, because of certain wells, from Pity (abridged) and from Pew (itself derived from appui) because of the royal tribune. It is a proof how thoroughly the memory of old devotion was effaced, that Stowe, who has preserved many documents about this royal chapel, thought for a time that it was near Charing Cross. He corrected his mistake in his second edition, but it has been perpetuated by writers who copied from his first.

founded a college of a dean and twelve canons to serve St. Stephen's Chapel. Probably from the chapel being in the royal palace it was not thought necessary to obliterate the wall paintings in the time of Henry VIII. ; but when the college was suppressed in 1548, and the chapel disused and converted into the Parliament House by Edward VI., the paintings were wainscoted over. Could their memory perish more effectually? So thought the perpetrators of this sacrilege ; and within the walls of St. Stephen's generation after generation of Parliamentary orators have declaimed and legislated against the generations that call Mary blessed, and have declared the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as practised by the Roman Catholic Church, to be superstitious and idolatrous,¹ while close to them, but unseen, were the painted records which connected Catholic devotion to our Lady with some of the greatest names of English history.

At length, in the year 1800, it was necessary to make some alterations, for the Parliament had become Imperial, and the Irish House was merged with the English and Scotch. The Annual Register will tell us what was then revealed. Under the head of Principal Occurrences, October 31, the annalist writes :

The alterations in the House of Commons, preparatory to the meeting of the Imperial Parliament, began in August. The oaken wainscoting at each side having been removed, gave again to the view the venerable walls of what was once St. Stephen's Chapel. The gothic pillars (? piers), the finished scroll-work, and the laboured carvings, were,

¹ The Test Oath (repealed) and the Coronation Oath still unrepealed.

generally speaking, in good preservation. But what is more observable is, that the paintings which fill the interstices, having been protected from the action of the air for so many centuries, are in many parts as fresh and vivid as if they could only boast a twelvemonths' date. In the right-hand corner, behind the Speaker's chair, and about five feet from the ground, there is a Virgin and Child, with Joseph bending over them, well preserved and tolerably executed in colour; and Edward III. and his Queen and suite, making their offerings to the Virgin. Under them in six niches, as many knights in armour, with their tabards of arms, and in each angle an acolyte holding a taper. Adjoining these, and on the same level, are two whole-length figures of angels, their heads reclining on the shoulders, and holding each, extended before them, a piece of drapery or mantle, charged with various devices or armorial bearings; their wings composed of peacock's feathers, very highly finished, and in which the green and gold are, in general, as lively as if they had been newly laid on. On each side of the altar are pictures of the Nativity, the Presentation in the Temple, the marriage in Cana, &c.¹

O sweet irony, worthy of our Lady, to make Edward VI. the involuntary instrument in preserving to us this splendid testimony to the piety of Edward III.! For what is this picture? It may either have commemorated an historical event, or its execution may be considered an historical event in itself. It is not, nor does it record, an act of private

¹ It is almost certain that the picture at the Gospel side of the altar, which was much mutilated, represented the Adoration of the Magian Kings, although our Lady is seated on a chair of state. (See Sir H. Englefield's dissertation, published by the Society of Antiquaries, 1811, and Smith's *History of Westminster*.) Yet the kneeling figures underneath this picture are Edward III. and his five sons, while under the picture of the Presentation in the Temple, at the Epistle side, are Queen Philippa and her daughters. St. George too is represented as turning towards the King and presenting him to our Lady, in the throne above. Thus the English royal family are uniting their homage with that recorded in the Gospels.

devotion. The King and Queen would have themselves depicted as surrounded by their family and by knights bearing their coats of arms. Acolytes were holding lighted tapers, and two angels were represented as taking part in a solemnity. It is the consecration of England, through its Sovereign, to the Blessed Virgin. It was before the eyes of every king and noble until hidden by Edward VI.

As Richard II. was thought to have been the King represented in the Roman picture, I will relate here an episode of his life, which will at least serve to show the spirit of the times in which England won her title. Richard, son of Edward, the Black Prince, and grandson of Edward III., had succeeded his grandfather at the age of eleven. In 1381, at the age of fifteen, he was a gallant and pious youth. It was the year of the great rising or rebellion of the people under the leadership of Wat Tyler. Though the peasants had many just grounds of complaint against the nobles and the Government, in their insurrection they had been guilty of wholesale massacres and reckless destruction of property. Amongst other crimes they had broken into the Tower of London, dragged the Archbishop, Simon of Sudbury, from the altar, and having murdered him had nailed derisively an ecclesiastical cap to the venerable head, which they fixed on London Bridge. This happened on the 14th June. The throne and even the life of the young King were in imminent danger. After the short repose of that terrible night the King rode from the Wardrobe in the city to Westminster, with the Lord Mayor, William Walworth, and about two hundred of his

nobles who had rallied round him. At Westminster he made his confession to a hermit priest, and then heard Mass in St. Stephen's Chapel, and ardently implored God's help. Thence he went to kneel before the image of Our Lady of the Pew, which, as I have said, was in a side-chapel. "This image," writes Froissart, "is famous for miracles and graces, and the Kings of England place great trust in it. The King then made his prayers before this image, and made an offering of himself to our Lady."¹ Froissart goes on to tell how, after this prayer, the King and his nobles rode towards London and met the rebels near Smithfield, and how, by a most unexpected turn of events, the insolent leader of the insurrection, Wat Tyler, was struck down by the Lord Mayor, and the rabble dispersed. The King, attributing his good fortune to our Lady's prayers, returned to Westminster, and again knelt before her image to express his gratitude.

Next year he was united in marriage with the daughter of the Emperor Charles IV., who was commonly called by her English subjects, "the good Queen Anne." It is certainly in no way unlikely that this Prince and his pious Queen may have joined in some solemn dedication of England to our Lady. A statue of Sir William Walworth, the loyal and brave Mayor, erected on Holborn Viaduct, near the scene of the meeting with Wat Tyler, commemorates the King's deliverance, but unfortunately there is at the present day no public monument in the streets or squares of London to her in whom the Catholic Kings of England and their people, nobles, citizens,

¹ *S'offrit à elle.* (Froissart.)

and peasants, put their trust. This, however, please God, may some day come.

Virgin-Glory, deign
 Into thy hand to take again
 This island's sceptre, thine before
 In the Christ-loving days of yore.
 Take it and by its gentle sway
 To better times ordain the way.¹

II.—Meaning of the Title.

It must not be thought for a moment that in calling England Our Lady's Dowry we are putting forth claims in depreciation of any other part of Christendom. We glory indeed in what our forefathers did for Mary, but we rejoice no less in the honours paid elsewhere. Strictly speaking, the word dowry does not even suggest a claim that England served our Lady with special tenderness and fervour, though this was doubtless the case. It implies that England ought thus to have served her, that she had bound herself by her own acts to do so, and that she made a public profession of love and homage. We institute, then, no comparisons. When our Lord asked St. Peter, "Lovest thou Me more than these?" the Apostle was prudently and humbly silent as regards others; yet he answered earnestly, "Lord, I love Thee; Thou knowest that I love Thee." So if our Blessed Lady, after our solemn consecration, should ask, "Catholics of England, do you love me more than the French or Italians?" it will be wise in us to make no idle boast; yet it will be good for us if we are able to say, with the approval of our consciences, "Lady, thou knowest that we love thee."

¹ Caswall, *A Tale of Tintern*.

It would be less invidious to boast of Mary's special love of England, for did not St. John call himself the disciple whom Jesus loved? But perhaps it is safer simply to recall the words applied to Mary by the Holy Church, *Ego diligentes me diligo*—"I love those that love me," and to strive to merit a special love as did our fathers. The word Dowry should be a title reminding us of duty, not exciting us to self-complacency. This is the sense in which it was first used. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Arundel, in issuing the ordinance or constitution that I have quoted, says that we should belie our name of Our Lady's Dowry, if we did not strive to surpass other nations in the homage we pay to her.

The English Hierarchy of 1893 write :

To sum up all, it may be said that, in the mind of the Holy Father, and in our mind, the object and purpose of this solemn consecration of England to the great Mother of God and to Blessed Peter is to obtain an abundant outpouring of blessings upon the whole country and people of England—the blessing of unity in Faith, Hope, and Charity, the blessing of such temporal plenty and prosperity as may redound to the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

There is a passage in the Prophet Ezechiel which proves at the same time how sin, when grown common, draws down national chastisement, and how powerful is the eminent sanctity, even of a few, to avert God's anger. God complained of all classes of His people ; of the prophets that they spake no truth and cared nothing for the loss of souls ; of the priests that they put no difference between holy and profane ; of the princes that they were rapacious like wolves ; of the people that they were avaricious, unjust, and cruel ;

and then God continued in these words : " I sought among them for a man that might set up a hedge, and stand in the gap before Me in favour of the land that I might not destroy it, and I found none. And I poured out My indignation upon them, in the fire of My wrath I consumed them, I have rendered their way upon their own head, saith the Lord God." ¹

The wall of God's protection was broken down by the universal and reiterated sins of every class. The anger or justice of God, like a besieging army, was advancing by the breach to the destruction of the city. In such a case the people are wont to choose their bravest captain, to give him a band of worthy companions, and to place them in the breach to keep back the enemy. God in His compassion complains that no such champion was forthcoming. He laments the absence of any saint of transcendent merits and mighty prayers, and that His justice must pursue its course, and that He must render to men their ways upon their own heads. These are terrible words ; but what a sublime picture do they present of the power of a great advocate with God !

It is then a holy and a wholesome thought to ask our Lady to be our champion, to stand in the gap in favour of the land. She has doubtless the power, she has doubtless also the will ; but we must merit her protection by the fervour and constancy of our prayers.

And here I would humbly suggest that, while we emulate the zeal of our forefathers, we need not be blind to their deficiencies. Was there not something of a national, ambitious, and warlike tone in some

¹ Ezech. xxii. 25—31.

of their appeals to our Lady to aid and protect her Dowry? Did they not think too much of Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt; of subduing another people to their will, rather than of subduing themselves to the holy will of God? We know how the victories which intoxicated our national pride were followed by national disasters, and how the nation that had cried: "Our Lady for her Dowry!" at Agincourt, was at last defeated and put to shame by the holy Maid of Orleans, who had prayed our Lady to have pity on her beloved France, ruined and down-trodden by the invaders. We may learn from this only to seek from our Lady what she can grant without injury to others or to ourselves.

Again, I do not doubt that even at the time of what is called the Reformation of England in the sixteenth century, the greater number of English men and women were loyal to our Lady; yet I look in vain for any national or even widespread endeavour, by having recourse to her, to avert the calamities that were threatening the land. In the great plagues called the Black Death, which ravaged England in the fifteenth century, there were processions and litanies. Again, in the year 1527, when Rome had been cruelly sacked and the Pope was a prisoner in his Castle of St. Angelo, there was a movement of general prayer throughout England in his behalf. The Bishops ordered united supplications to be made; and those supplications were successful. The Pope escaped from his persecutors, and he was soon after restored to his throne. But when four years later Henry VIII. began his exactions and usurpations upon the Church in England, when he

was putting forth one impious and sacrilegious claim after another, I do not find the Bishops calling on the clergy and people to unite in one common prayer to our Lady to avert impending dangers, and to keep them faithful to God and His Church. Yet this might have been done, at least in the early part of the struggle, in such a way as not to exasperate the monarch. And I cannot but think that, if the nation had then remembered that it was Our Lady's Dowry, and had appealed to her for succour and protection, the history of England might have been far different. The prayers of the Queen of Heaven, earnestly sought, would have effectually baffled the angry passions of the earthly tyrant; the clergy might have stood firm by the side of Blessed Fisher, the monastic orders supported the holy Carthusians, the nobility taken their stand by Blessed More, and the King would have been forced to yield.

May we then, I repeat, emulate the piety, but take warning from the remissness of our forefathers. There are evils to be combated not less grievous than the tyranny of a king. The prevalence of drunkenness, the sin of unchastity, profanation of God's name, the neglect of Holy Mass, these are evils among ourselves that, if they continue, will make it seem like an idle boast to call ourselves Our Lady's Dowry. And the ever-increasing spread of infidelity, the deluge of bad books, the corrupting of heathen nations by the sale of our opium and our fire-water, these things are national sins against which we must contend by imploring the prayers of her who is called the Help of Christians.

The present action on the part of our Bishops is

as when Ezechias sent posts with letters to all Israel and Juda, proclaiming: "Ye children of Israel, turn again to the Lord the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Israel; and He will return to the remnant of you that hath escaped the hand of the King of the Assyrians; . . . yield yourselves to the Lord and come to His sanctuary, which He hath sanctified for ever; serve the Lord the God of your fathers, and the wrath of His indignation shall be turned away from you."¹

Agès had passed, yet Abraham, Isaac, and Israel were ever living before the Lord. For their sake He was ready to show mercy to their children. Nor are Augustine and Bede, and Cuthbert, Anselm, and Thomas, and Edward and Edmund, dead at this day. They are praying for *Our Lady's Dowry*. Is Mary not "the Sanctuary that God hath sanctified for ever"? May her protection for ever sanctify her children!

Men had robbed our Queen of her dower,
Robbed thy dower of thee, sweet Queen;
Dark and dreary without thy smiles
Our meads and cities for years have been.
Queen of our hearts! Queen of the world!
Rend thine own from the spoiler's power;
Come back again,
Over us reign,
Take us once more for thy Royal Dower.

NOTE.

It will not be inappropriate to this history, in which I have said so much of the Catholic use and veneration of images, if I add a few amusing instances

¹ 2 Paral. xxx 6—8.

of the controversies aroused by the destruction of images, which were only brought to light in the publication of State Papers in 1892.

In 1538, William Smith, servant to Sir Roger Wentworth, blamed a certain minstrel named Hunt, for singing at a bridal a song railing against saints and calling their images idols. Hunt defended himself, saying they were set up in times past by the Bishop of Rome, but now the King is Supreme Head, and the Bishop of Rome has nothing to do here. Smith asked if previous kings had not been as wise as this King, and yet they obeyed the Pope, and all other kings do so still, and he wished to know who gave the King leave to put the Pope down.¹ This speech got poor Smith into trouble.—Some of the parishioners of Gracechurch, London, accuse their curate, Mr. Laborne, of saying that St. Austin landed in the Isle of Thanet, with a cross of wood and a picture of Christ, and that then there were as wise men as now be. The parishioners reply in their memorial that all the doings of St. Austin, being the legate of a reprobate master, the Pope, were not commendable.²—Sir Thomas Cowley, Vicar of Ticehurst, was accused because he said “the people would not dare to spit upon the King’s face on a groat, but would spit upon an image, which was spitting upon God.”³—Nicolas Porter, parson of Freshwater, in the Isle of Wight, was accused of having said, “Lo, while this King and his Council were busy to pull down abbeys, he was made cuckold at home.”⁴

¹ *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII.* vol. xiii. part i. n. 615.

² *Ibid.* n. 1111.

³ *Ibid.* n. 1149.

⁴ *Ibid.* n. 493.



COLOGAN, W.H.

The Church of old England.

BQX

2016

.C6.

v.3

